National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor. | Without Concealment—Without Compromise. | EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, } Corresponding Editors

VOL. X.---NO. 42. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1850. | WHOLE NUMBER 510.

Published Weekly,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

Terms,
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to S. H. Gay, New York.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to Francis Jackson, Treasurer, at Boston; or S. H. Gay, New-York.

NORRIS, PRINTER.

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN C. CALHOUN,

ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

Delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 4, 1850.

I have, Senators, believed from the first, that the agitation of the subject of Slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion. Entertaining this opinion, I have, on all former occasions, endeavored to call the attention of both of the two great parties which divide the country, to adopt some such measure to prevent so great a disaster; but without success. The agitation has been permitted to proceed, with almost no attempt to resist it, until it has reached a period when it can no longer be disguised or denied that the Union is in danger. You have thus had forced upon you the greatest and the gravest question that ever can come under your consideration, How can the Union be preseserved?

To give a satisfactory answer to this mighty question, it is indispensable to have an accurate and thorough knowledge of the nature and the character of the cause by which the Union is endangered. Without such knowledge it is impossible to pronounce, with any certainty, by what measure it can be saved: just as it would be impossible for a physician to pronounce, in the case of some dangerous disease, with any certainty by what remedy the patient could be saved, without similar knowledge of the nature and character of the cause of the disease. The first question, then presented for consideration, in the investigation I propose, in order to obtain such knowledge, is—What is it that has endangered the Union?

To this question, there can be but one answer—that the immediate cause is, the almost universal discontent which pervades all the States composing the Southern section of the Union. This widely extended discontent is not of recent origin. It commenced with the agitation of the Slavery question, and has been increasing ever since. The next question is,—What has caused this wide-diffused and almost universal discontent?

It is a great mistake to suppose, as is by some, that it originated with demagogues, who excited the discontent with the intention of aiding their personal advancement, or with disappointed ambitious individuals, who resorted to it as the means of raising their fallen fortunes. There is no foundation for this opinion. On the contrary, all the great political influences of the section were arrayed against excitement, and exerted to the utmost to keep the people quiet. The great mass of the people of the South were divided, as in the other section, into whigs and democrats. The leaders and the presses of both parties in the South were very solicitous to prevent excitement and restore quiet; because it was seen that the effects of the former would necessarily tend to weaken, if not destroy, the political ties which united them with their respective parties in the other section. Those who know the strength of party ties, will readily appreciate the immense force which this cause exerted against agitation, and in favor of preserving quiet. But as great as it was, it was not sufficiently so to prevent the wide-spread discontent which now pervades the section. No; some cause far deeper and more powerful must exist, to produce a discontent so wide and deep, than the one inferred. The question then recurs, what is the cause of this discontent? It will be found in the belief of the people of the Southern States, as prevalent as the discontent itself, that they cannot remain, as things now are, consistently with honor and safety, in the Union. The next question, then, to be considered is, what has caused this belief?

One of the causes is, undoubtedly, to be traced to the long-continued agitation of the slave question on the part of the North, and the many aggressions which they have made on the rights of the South, during the time. I will not enumerate them at present, as it will be done hereafter in its proper place.

There is another, lying back of it, but with which this is intimately connected, that may be regarded as the great and primary cause. It is to be found in the fact, that the equilibrium between the two sections in the government, as it stood when the constitution was ratified and the government put into action, has been destroyed. At that time, there was nearly a perfect equilibrum between the two, which afforded ample means to each to protect itself against the aggression of the other; but as it now stands, one section has exclusive power of controlling the government, which leaves the other without any adequate means of protecting itself against its encroachments and oppression. To place this subject distinctly before you, I have, Senators, prepared a brief statistical statement, showing the relative weight of the two sections in the government, under the first census of 1790, and the last census of 1840.

According to the former, the population of the United States, including Vermont, Kentucky and Tennessee, which then were in their incipient condition of becoming States, but were not actually admitted, amounted to 3,929,827. Of this number, the Northern States had 1,977,899, and the Southern 1,952,072, making a difference of only 25,827 in favor of the former States. The number of States, including Vermont, Kentucky and Tennessee, was sixteen, of which eight, including Vermont, belonged to the Northern section, and eight, including Kentucky and Tennessee, to the Southern, making an equal division of the States between the two sections, under the first census. There was a small preponderance in the House of Representatives, and in the electoral college, in favor of the Northern, owing to the fact that, according to the provisions of the constitution, in estimating federal numbers, five slaves count but three; but it was too small to affect sensibly the perfect equilibrium of numbers which, with that exception, existed at that time—a true perfect equilibrium. Such was the equality of the two sections when the States composing them agreed to enter into a federal Union. Since then, the equilibrium between them has been greatly disturbed.

According to the last census, the aggregate population, of the United States amounted to 17,063,357, of which the Northern section contained 9,728,920, and the Southern 7,334,437, making a difference in round numbers, of 2,400,000. The number of States had increased from sixteen to twenty-six, making an addition of ten States. In the mean time, the position of Delaware had become doubtful, as to which section she properly belonged. Considering her as neutral, the Northern States will have thirteen, and the Southern States twelve, making a difference in the Senate of two Senators in favor of the former.—According to the apportionment under the census of 1840, there were 223 members of the House of Representatives, of which the Northern States had 135, and the Southern States, (considering Delaware as neutral) 87: making a difference in favor of the former, in the House of Representatives, of 48; the difference in the Senate of two members added to this, gives to the North in the electoral college, a majority of 50. Since the census of 1840, four States have been added to the Union; Iowa, Wisconsin, Florida, and Texas. They leave the difference in the Senate as it stood when the census was taken, but add two to the side of the North in the House, making the present majority in the House in its favor, of 50, and in the electoral college of 52.

The result of the whole is to give the Northern section a predominance in every department of the government, and thus concentrate it in the two elements which constitute the federal government—majority of States, and a majority of their population, estimated in federal numbers. Whatever section concentrates the two in itself, must possess control of the entire government.

But we are just at the close of the sixth decade, and at the commencement of the seventh. The census is to be taken this year, which must add greatly to the decided preponderance of the North in the House of Representatives, and in the electoral college. The prospect, is, also that a great increase will be added to its present preponderance during the period of the decade, by the addition of new States. Two territories—Oregon and Minnesota—are already in progress, and strenuous efforts are making to bring in three additional States from the territory recently conquered from Mexico, which, if successful, will add three other States in a short time to the Northern section, making five States, and increasing its present number of States from 15 to 20, and of its Senators from 30 to 40. On the contrary, there is not a single territory in progress in the Southern section, and no certainty that any additional State will be added to it during the decade. The prospect then is, that the two sections in the Senate, should the efforts now made to exclude the South from the newly conquered territories succeed, will stand before the end of the decade, twenty Northern States to twelve Southern (conceding Delaware to be neutral), and forty Northern Senators to twenty-four Southern. This great increase of Senators, added to the great increase of members of the House of Representatives, and electoral college, on the part of the North, which must take place upon the next decade, will effectually and eventually destroy the equilibrium which existed when the government commenced.

Had this destruction been the operation of time, without the interference of government, the South would have had no reason to complain; but such was not the fact. It was caused by the legislation of this government, which was appointed as the common agent of all, and charged with the protection of the interests and security of all. The legislation by which it has been effected may be classed under three heads. The first is that series of acts by which the South has been excluded from the common territory belonging to all of the States, as the members of the federal Union, which has had the effect of extending vastly the portion allotted to the Northern section, and restricting within narrow limits the portion left the South. The next consists in adopting a system of revenue and disbursements by which an undue proportion of the burthen of taxation has been imposed upon the South, and an undue proportion of its proceeds appropriated to the North; and the last in a system of political measures by which the original character of the government has been radically changed.

I propose to bestow upon each of these, in the order they stand, a few remarks, with the view of showing that it is owing to the action of this government, that the equilibrium between the two sections has been destroyed, and the whole power of the system centred in a sectional majority.

The first of the series of acts by which the South was deprived of its due share of the territories, originated with the confederacy which preceded the existence of this government. It is to be found in the provisions of the ordinance of 1787. Its effect was to exclude the South entirely from that vast and fertile region which lies between the Ohio and the Mississippi, now embracing five States and one Territory. The next of the series is the Missouri compromise, which excluded the South from that large portion of Louisiana which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min., excepting what is included in the State of Missouri.—The last of the series excludes the South from the whole of the Oregon Territory. All these, in the slang of the day, were what is called slave territory, and not free soil; that is, territories belonging to slaveholding powers, and open to the emigration of masters with their slaves. By these several acts, the South was excluded from 1,238,025 square miles, an extent of country considerably exceeding the entire valley of the Mississippi. To the South was left the portion of the territory of Louisiana lying south of 36 deg. 30 min., and the portion north of it included in the State of Missouri; the portion lying south of 36 deg. 30 min., includes the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, and the territory lying west of the latter and south of 36 deg. 30 min., called the Indian country. A portion lying south of this, with the territory of Florida, now the State, makes in the whole 283,503 square miles. To this must be added the territory acquired with Texas. If the whole should be added to the Southern section, it would make an increase of 325,520, which would make the whole left to the South 609,023. But a large part of Texas is still in contest between the two sections, which leaves uncertain what will be the real extent of the portion of her territory that may be left to the South.

I have not included the territory recently acquired by the treaty with Mexico. The North is making the most strenuous efforts to appropriate the whole to herself, by excluding the South from every foot of it. If she should succeed, it will add to that from which Southern laws have already been excluded, 527,078 square miles, and would increase the whole the North has appropriated to herself, to 1,764,023, not including the portion which she may succeed in excluding us from in Texas. To sum up the whole, the United States, since they declared their independence, have acquired 2,373,040 square miles of territory, from which the North will have excluded the South, if she should succeed in monopolizing the newly acquired territories, about three-fourths of the whole, and leave the South but about one-fourth.

Such is the first and great cause that has destroyed the equilibrium between the two sections in the government.

The next is the system of revenue and disbursements which has been adopted by the government It is well known that the main source from which the government has derived its revenue, is from duties on imports. I shall not undertake to show that all such duties must necessarily fall mainly on the exporting States, and that the South, as the great exporting portion of the Union, has in reality paid vastly more than her due proportion of the revenue, because I deem it unnecessary, as the subject has on so many occasions been fully discussed. Nor shall I, for the same reason, undertake to show, that a far greater portion of the revenue has been disbursed at the North than its due share; and that the joint effect of these causes has been to transfer a vast amount from the South to the North, which, under an equal system of revenue and disbursement, would not have been lost to her. If to this be added, that many of the duties were imposed, not for revenue, but for protection, that is, intended to put money, not into the treasury, but directly into the pocket of the manufacturers, some conception may be formed of the immense amount which in the long course of so many years has been transferred from the South to the North. There is no date by which it can be estimated with any certainty: but, it is safe to say, that it amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. Under the most moderate estimate, it would be sufficient to add greatly to the wealth of the North, and by that greatly increase her population, by attracting emigration from all quarters to that direction.

This, combined with the great and primary cause, amply explains why the North has acquired a preponderance over every department of the government, by the disproportionate increase of population and States. The former, as has been shown, has increased, in fifty years 2,400,000 over that of the South. This increase of population, during so long a period, is satisfactorily accounted for by the number of emigrants, and the increase of their descendants, which has been attracted to the Northern section from Europe and the Southern section, in consequence of the advantages derived from the causes assigned. If they had not existed—if the South had retained all the capital which has been extracted from her by the fiscal action of the government, and if they had not been excluded, by the ordinance of 1787 and the Missouri compromise, from the region lying between the Ohio and the Mississippi, and between the Miss. and the Rocky mountains, North of 36 30, it scarcely admits of a doubt that she would have divided the emigration with the North, and by retaining her own people, would have at least equalled the North in population, under the census of 1840, and probably under that about to be taken. She would, also, if she had retained her equal rights in those territories, have maintained an equality in the number of States with the North, and have preserved the equilibrium between the two sections that existed at the commencement of the government. The loss, then, of the equilibrium is to be attributed to the action of this government.

But while these measures were destroying the equilibrium between the two sections, the action of the government was leading to a radical change in its character, by concentrating all the power of the system in itself. The occasion will not permit me to trace the measures by which this great change has been consummated. If it did, it would not be difficult to show, that the process commenced at an early period of the government; that it proceeded almost without interruption, step by step, until it absorbed, virtually, its entire powers. Without, however, going through the whole process to establish the fact, it may be done satisfactorily by a very short statement.

That this government claims, and practically maintains the right to decide in the last resort, as to the extent of its powers, will scarcely be denied by any one conversant with the political history of the country, is equally certain. That it also claims the right to resort to force, to maintain whatever power she claims against all opposition. Indeed, it is apparent from what we daily hear, that this has become the prevailing and fixed opinion of a great majority of the community. Now, I ask, what limitation can possibly be placed upon the powers of a government, claiming and exercising such rights? And, if none can be, how can the separate government of the States maintain and protect the powers reserved to them by the constitution, or the people of the several States maintain those which are reserved to them, and among them, their sovereign powers, by which they ordained and established, not only their separate State constitutions and governments, but also the constitution and government of the United States? But if they have no constitutional means of maintaining them against the right claimed by this government, it necessarily follows, that they hold them at its pleasure and discretion, and that all the powers of the system are, in reality, concentrated in it. It also follows, that the character of the government has been changed in consequence, from a republic, as it originally came from the hands of its framers, and that it has been changed into a great national consolidated democracy. It has, indeed, all the characteristics of the latter, and not one of the former, although it still retains its outward form.

The result of the whole of these causes combined, is that the North has acquired a decided ascendancy over every department of this government, and, through it, a control over all the powers of the system. A single section, governed by the will of the numerical majority, has now, in fact, the control of the government, and the entire powers of the system. What was once a constitutional federal republic, is now converted in reality, into one as absolute as that of the of the Autocrat of Russia, and as despotic in its tendency as any absolute government that ever existed.

As, then, the North has the absolute control over the government, it is manifest, that on all questions between it and the South, where there is a diversity of interests, the interest of the latter will be sacrificed to the former, however oppressive the effects may be, as the South possesses no means by which it can resist, through the action of the government. But if there were no questions of vital importance to the South, in reference to which there was a diversity of views between the two sections, this state of things might be endured, without the hazard of destruction by the South. But such is not the fact. There is a question of vital importance to the Southern section, in reference to which the views and feelings of the two sections are opposite and hostile as they can possibly be.

I refer to the relations between the two races in the Southern section, which constitutes a vital portion of her social organization. Every portion of the North entertains views and feelings more or less hostile to it. Those most opposed and hostile regard it as a sin, and consider themselves under the most sacred obligation to use every effort to destroy it. Indeed, to the extent that they conceive they have power, they regard themselves as implicated in the sin, and responsible for supressing it, by the use of all and every means. Those less opposed and hostile regard it as a crime—an offence against humanity, as they call it, and although not so fanatical, feel themselves bound to use all efforts to effect the same object. While those who are least opposed and hostile, regard it as a blot and a stain on the character of what they call the nation, and feel themselves accordingly bound to give it no countenance or support. On the contrary, the Southern section regard the relation as one which cannot be destroyed without subjecting the two races to the greatest calamity, and the section to poverty, desolation, and wretchedness, and accordingly feel bound, by every consideration of interest, safety, duty, to defend it.

This hostile feeling on the part of the North towards the social organization of the South, long lay dormant; but it only required some cause, which would make the impression on those who felt most intensely that they were responsible for its continuance, to call it into action. The increasing power of this government, and of the control of the Northern section over all of it, furnished the cause. It was they made an impression on the minds of many, that there was little or no restraint to prevent the government to do whatever it might choose to do. This was sufficient of itself to put the most fanatical portion of the North in action, for the purpose of destroying the existing relation between the two races in the South.

The first organized movement towards it commenced in 1835. Then for the first time societies were organized, presses established, lectures sent forth to excite the people of the North, and incendiary publications scattered over the whole South through the mail. The South was thoroughly aroused; meetings were held everywhere, and resolutions adopted, calling upon the North to apply a remedy to arrest the threatened evil, and pledging themselves to adopt measures for their own protection if it was not arrested. At the meeting of Congress petitions poured in from the North, calling upon Congress to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, and to prohibit what they called the internal slave trade between the States, avowing at the same time, that their ultimate object was to abolish Slavery not only in the District, but in the States and throughout the Union. At this period, the number engaged in the agitation was small, and it possessed little or no personal influence.

Neither party in Congress had, at that time, any sympathy with them or their cause; the members of each party presented their petitions with great reluctance. Nevertheless, as small and as contemptible as the party then was, both of the great parties of the North dreaded them. They felt that though small, they were organized, in reference to a subject which had a great and a commanding influence over the Northern mind. Each party, on that account, feared to oppose their petitions, least the opposite party should take advantage of the one who opposed by favoring them. The effect was, that both united in insisting that the petitions should be received, and Congress take jurisdiction of the subject for which they prayed; and to justify their course, took the extraordinary ground that Congress was bound to receive petitions on every subject, however objectionable it might be, and whether they had, or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views prevailed in the House of Representatives, and partially in the Senate, and thus the party succeeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agitation could be extended over the whole Union. This was the commencement of the agitation, which has ever since continued, and which, as it is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union itself.

As to myself, I believed, at that early period, that, if the party who got up the petitions should succeed in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that agitation would follow, and that it would, in the end, if not arrested, destroy the Union. I then so expressed myself in debate, and called upon both parties to take grounds against taking jurisdiction, but in vain. Had my voice been heard, and Congress refused to take jurisdiction by the united votes of all parties, the agitation which followed would have been prevented, and the fanatical movements accompanying the agitation, which have brought us to our present perilous condition, would have become extinct, from the want of something to feed the flame. That was the time for the North to show her devotion to the Union; but unfortunately, both of the great parties of that section were so intent on obtaining or retaining party ascendancy, that all other considerations were overlooked or forgotten.

What has since followed, are but natural consequences. With the success of their first movement, this small fanatical party began to acquire strength, and, with that, to become an object of courtship of both of the great parties. The necessary consequence was, a farther increase of power, and a gradual tainting of the opinions of both of the other parties with their doctrines, until the infection has extended over both, and the great mass of the population of the North, who, whatever may be their opinion of the original abolition party which still keeps up its distinctive organization, hardly ever fail, when it comes to acting, to coöperate in carrying out their measures. With the increase of their influence, they extend the sphere of their action. In a short period after they had commenced their first movement, they had acquired sufficient influence to induce the Legislatures of most of the Northern States to pass acts, which, in effect, abrogated the provision of the constitution that provides for the delivering up of fugitive slaves. Not long after, petititions followed to abolish Slavery in forts, magazines and dockyards, and all other places where Congress had exclusive power of legislation. This was followed by petitions and resolutions of legislatures of the Northern States, and popular meetings, to exclude the Southern States, from all territories acquired, and to prevent the admission of any State hereafter into the Union, which, by its constitution, does not prohibit Slavery. And Congress is invoked to do all this, expressly with the view of the final abolition of Slavery in the States. That has been avowed to be the ultimate object, from the beginning of the agitation until the present time, and yet the great body of both parties of the North, with the full knowledge of the fact, although disowning the abolitionists, have coöperated with them in all their measures.

Such is a brief history of the agitation, as far as it has yet advanced. Now, I ask, Senators, what is there to prevent its further progress, until it fulfils the ultimate end proposed, unless some decisive measure should be adopted to prevent it? Has any one of the causes, which has added to its increase from its original small and contemptible beginning, until it has attained its present magnitude, diminished in force? Is the original cause of the movement—that Slavery is a sin, and ought to be suppressed—weaker now than at the commencement? or is the Abolition party less numerous or influential? or have they less influence over elections? or less control over the two great parties of the North in elections? or has the South greater means of influencing or controlling the movements of this government now than it had when the agitation commenced? To all these questions but one answer can be given. No. No. No. The very reverse is true. Instead of weaker, all the elements in favor of agitation are stronger now than they were in 1835, when the agitation first commenced. While all the elements of influence on the part of the South are weaker, I again ask, what is to stop this agitation, unless something decisive is done, until the great and final object at which it aims—the abolition of Slavery in the South—is consummated? Is it, then, not certain, that if something decisive is not now done to arrest it, the South will be forced to choose between abolition or secession? Indeed, as events are now moving, it will not require the South to secede, to dissolve the Union; agitation will of itself effect it, of which its past history furnishes abundant proof, as I shall next proceed to show.

It is a great mistake to suppose that disunion can be effected by a single blow. The cords which bound these States together in one common union, are far too numerous and powerful for that. Disunion must be the work of time. It is only through a long process and in succession, that the cords can snap, until the whole fabric falls asunder. Already, the agitation of the Slavery question has snapped some of the most important, and has greatly weakened all the others, as I shall proceed to show.

The cords that bind the States together are not only many, but various in character. Among them, some are spiritual or ecclesiastical; some political; others social; others appertain to the benefits conferred by the Union; and others to the feelings of duty and obligation.

The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature, consisted in the unity of the great religious denominations, all of which originally embraced the Union. All these denominations, with the exception, perhaps, of the Catholics, were organized very much upon the principle of our political institutions. Beginning with smaller meetings, corresponding with the political divisions of the country, their organization terminated in one great central assemblage, corresponding very much with the character of Congress. At these meetings, the principal clergymen and lay members of the respective denominations from all parts of the Union met, to transact business relating to their common concerns. It was not confined to what appertained to the doctrines and discipline of the respective denominations, but extended to plans for disseminating the Bible, establishing missionaries, distributing tracts and of establishing presses for the publication of tracts, newspapers and periodicals, with a view of diffusing religious information, and for the support of the doctrines and creeds of the denomination. All this combined, contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of the Union. The strong ties which held each denomination together, formed a strong cord to hold the whole Union together; but, as powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effect of Slavery agitation.

The first of these cords which snapped under its explosive force, was that of the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together are all broke, and its unity gone. They now form separate churches, and instead of that feeling of attachment and devotion to the interests of the whole church, which was formerly felt, they are now arrayed into two hostile bodies, engaged in litigation about what was formerly their common property.

The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists, one of the largest and most respectable of the denominations; that of the Presbyterians is not entirely snapped, but some of its strands have given way: that of the Episcopal church is the only one of the four great Protestant denominations which remain unbroken and entire. The strongest cord of a political character consists of the many and strong ties that have held together the two great parties, which have, with some modifications, existed from the beginning of the government. They both extended to every portion of the Union, and had strongly contributed to hold all its parts together. But this powerful cord has proved no better than the spiritual. It resisted for a long time the explosive tendency of the agitation, but has finally snapped under its force—if not entirely, nearly so. Nor is there one of the remaining cords which has not been greatly weakened. To this extent the Union has already been destroyed by agitation, in the only way it can be, by snapping asunder and weakening the cords which bind it together.

If the agitation goes on, the same force acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, there will be nothing left to hold the States together, except force. But surely, that can with no propriety of language be called a Union, when the only means by which the weaker is held connected with the stronger portion is force. It may, indeed, keep them connected, but the connection will partake much more of the character of subjugation on the part of the weaker to the stronger, than the union of free, independent and sovereign States in one federal union, as they stood in the early stages of the government, and which only is worthy of the sacred name of Union.

Having now, Senators, explained what it is that endangers the Union, and traced it to its cause, and explained its nature and character, the great question again recurs, How can the Union be saved? To this answer, there is but one way by which it can be, and that is by adopting such measures as will satisfy the States belonging to the Southern section that they can remain in the Union consistently with their honor and safety. There is, again, only one way by which that can be effected, and that is by reviewing the causes by which this belief has been produced. Do that, and discontent will cease, harmony and kind feelings between the sections be restored, and every apprehension of danger to the Union removed. The question then is, by what means can this be done? But before I undertake to answer this question, I propose to show by what it cannot be done.

It cannot, then, be done by eulogies on the Union, however splendid or numerous. The cry of Union! Union! the glorious Union! can no more prevent disunion, than the cry of health! health! glorious health! on the part of the physician, can save a patient lying dangerously ill. So long as the Union, instead of being regarded as a protector, is regarded in the opposite character by not much less than a majority of the States, it will be in vain to attempt to concentrate them by pronouncing eulogies on it.

Besides, this cry of Union comes commonly from those whom we cannot believe to be sincere. It usually comes from our assailants; but we cannot believe them to be sincere; for if they loved the Union, they would necessarily be devoted to the constitution. It made the Union, and to destroy the constitution, would be to destroy the Union. But the only reliable and certain evidence of devotion to the constitution is, to abstain, on the one hand, from violating it, and to repel, on the other, all attempts to violate it. It is only by faithfully performing those high duties, that the constitution can be preserved, and with it the Union.

But how then stands the profession of devotion to the Union by our assailants, when brought to this test? Have they abstained from violating the constitution? Let the many acts passed by the Northern States to set aside and annul the clause of the constitution providing for the delivering up of fugitive slaves, answer. I cite this, not that it is the only instance (for there are many others,) but because the violation, in this particular, is too notorious and palpable to be denied. Again, have they stood forth faithfully to repel violations of the constitution? Let their course in reference to the agitation of the Slavery question, which was commenced, and has been carried on, for fifteen years, avowedly for the purpose of abolishing Slavery in the States—an object all acknowledged to be unconstitutional—answer. Let them show a single instance, during this long period, in which they have denounced the agitators, or their many attempts to affect what is admitted to be unconstitutional, or a single measure which they have opposed, or formed for that purpose. How can we, with all these facts before us, believe that they are sincere in their profession of devotion to the Union, or avoid believing that, by assuming the cloak of patriotism, their profession is but intended to increase the vigor of their assaults, and to weaken the force of our resistance?

Nor can we regard the profession of devotion to the Union, on the part of those who are not our assailants, as sincere, when they pronounce eulogies upon the Union evidently with the intent of charging us with disunion, without uttering one word of denunciation against our assailants. If friends of the Union, their course should be to unite with us in repelling these assaults, and denouncing the authors as enemies of the Union. Why they avoid this and pursue the course they obviously do, it is for them to explain.

Nor can the Union be saved by invoking the name of the illustrious Southerner, whose mortal remains repose on the western bank of the Potomac. He was one of us—a slaveholder and a planter. We have studied his history, and find nothing in it to justify submission to wrong. On the contrary, his great fame rests on the solid foundation, that while he was careful to avoid doing wrong to others, he was prompt and decided in repelling wrong. I trust that, in this respect, we profited by his example.

Nor can we find anything in his history to deter us from seceding from the Union, should it fail to fulfil the objects for which it was instituted, by being permanently and hopelessly converted into the means of oppression instead of protection. On the contrary, we find much in his example to encourage us, should we be forced to the extremity of deciding between submission and disunion.

There existed then, as well as now, a union—that between the parent country and her then colonies. It was a union that had much to endear it to the people of the colonies. Under its protecting and superintending care, the colonies were planted, and grew up and prospered through a long course of years, until they became populous and wealthy. Its benefits were not limited to them. Their extensive agricultural and other productions gave birth to a flourishing commerce, which richly rewarded the parent country for the trouble and expense of establishing and protecting them. Washington was born and nurtured, and grew up to manhood under that union. He acquired his early distinction in its service; and there is every reason to believe that he was devotedly attached to it. But his devotion was a rational one. He was attached to it, not as an end, but as a means to an end. When it failed to fulfil its end, and, instead of affording protection, was converted into the means of oppressing the colonies, he did not hesitate to draw his sword and head the great movement by which that union was forever severed, and the independence of these States established. This was the great and crowning glory of his life, which has spread his fame over the whole globe, and will transmit it to the latest posterity.

Nor can the plan proposed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, nor that of the administration, save the Union. I shall pass by, without remark, the plan proposed by the Senator, and proceed directly to the consideration of that of the administration. I however assure the distinguished and able Senator, that in taking this course, no disrespect is intended to him or his plan. I have adopted it, because so many Senators of distinguished abilities, who were present when he delivered his speech and explanation of his plan, and who were fully capable to do justice to the side they support, have replied to him.

The plan of the administration cannot save the Union, because it can have no effect in satisfying the States composing the Southern section of the Union, that they can consistently with safety and honor remain in the Union. It is, in fact, but a modification of the Wilmot proviso. It proposes to effect the same object—to exclude the South from all the territory acquired by the Mexican treaty. It is well known that the South is united against the Wilmot proviso, and has committed itself by solemn resolutions to resist, should it be adopted. Its opposition is not to the name, but to that which it proposes to effect. That the Southern States hold it to be unconstitutional, unjust, inconsistent with their equality as members of the common Union, and calculated to destroy irretrievably the equilibrium between the two sections. These objections equally apply to what, for brevity, I will call the Executive proviso. There is no difference between it and the Wilmot, except in the mode of effecting the object; and in that respect, I must say, that the latter is much the least objectionable. It goes to its object openly, boldly, and directly. It claims for Congress unlimited power over the territories, and proposes to assert it over the territories acquired from Mexico, by a positive prohibition of Slavery. Not so the Executive proviso. It takes an indirect course, and in order to elude the Wilmot proviso, and thereby avoid encountering the united and determined resistance of the South, it denies, by implication, the authority of Congress to legislate for the territories, and claims the right as belonging exclusively to the inhabitants of the territories. But to effect the object of excluding the South, it takes care, in the meantime, in letting in emmigrants from the Northern States, and other quarters, except emmigrants from the South, which it takes special care to exclude, by holding up to them the dread of having their slaves liberated under the Mexican laws. The necessary consequence is, to exclude the South from the territory, just as effectually as would the Wilmot proviso. The only difference in this respect is, that what one proposes to effect directly and openly, the other proposes to effect indirectly and covertly.

But the Executive proviso is more objectionable still than the Wilmot, in another and more important particular. The latter, to effect its object, inflicts a dangerous wound upon the constitution, by depriving the Southern States, as joint partners and owners of the territories, of their rights in them; but it effects no greater wound than is absolutely necessary to effect its object. The former, on the contrary, while it inflicts the same wound, inflicts others equally great, and if possible greater, as I shall next proceed to explain.

In claiming the right for the inhabitants, instead of Congress, to legislate over the territories, in the Executive proviso, it assumes that the sovereignty over the territories is vested in the former: or, to express it in the language used in a resolution offered by one of the Senators from Texas, (Gen. Houston, now absent,) "they have the same inherent right of self-government as the people in the States." The assumption is utterly false, unconstitutional, without example, and contrary to the entire practice of the government, from the commencement to the present time, as I shall next proceed to show.

The recent movement of individuals in California to form a Constitution and a State government, and to appoint Senators and Representatives, is the first fruit of this monstrous assumption. If the individuals who have made this movement, had gone into California as adventurers, and, if as such, they had conquered the territory, and established their independence, the sovereignty of the country would have been vested in them as a separate and independent community. In that case, they would have had the right to form a constitution, and to establish a government for themselves; and, if after that they had thought proper to apply to Congress for admission into the Union as a sovereign and independent State, all this would have been regular and according to established principles. But such is not the case. It was the United States who conquered California, and finally acquired it by treaty. The sovereignty, of course, is vested in them, and not in the individuals who have attempted to form a constitution as a State, without their consent. All this is clear beyond controversy, except it can be shown that they have since lost or been divested of their sovereignty.

Nor is it less clear that the power of legislating over the territory is vested in Congress, and not, as is assumed, in the inhabitants of the territories. None can deny that the Government of the United States have the power to acquire territories, either by war or by treaty; but if the power to acquire exists, it belongs to Congress to carry it into execution. On this point there can be no doubt, for the constitution expressly provides, that Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers," (those vested in Congress) "and all other powers vested by this constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof." It matters not, then, where the power is vested; for if vested at all in the government of the United States, or any of its departments or officers, the power carrying it into execution is clearly vested in Congress. But this important proviso, while it gives to Congress the power of legislating over territories, imposes important restrictions on its exercise, by restricting Congress to passing laws necessary and proper for carrying the power into execution. The prohibition extends, not only to all laws not suitable or appropriate to the object, but also to all that are unjust, unequal, or unfair, for all such laws would be unnecessary and improper, and, therefore, unconstitutional.

Having now established, beyond controversy, that the sovereignty over the territories is vested in the United States—that is, in the several States composing the Union—and that the power of legislating over them is expressly vested in Congress, it follows that the individuals in California who have undertaken to form a constitution and a State, and to exercise the power of legislation, without the consent of Congress, have usurped the sovereignty of the States and the authority of Congress, and have acted in open defiance of both. In other words, what they have done is revolutionary and rebellious in its character, anarchal in its tendency, and calculated to lead to the most dangerous consequences. Had they acted from premeditation and design, it would have been in fact an actual rebellion, but such is not the case. The blame lies much less upon them, than upon those who have induced them to take a course so unconstitutional and dangerous. They have been led into it by language held there, and the course pursued by the executive branch of the government.

I have not seen the answer of the Executive to the calls made by the two houses of Congress, for information as to the course which it took, or the part which it acted in reference to what was done in California. I understand the answers have not yet been printed. But there is enough known to justify the assertion, that those who profess to represent and act under the authority of the Executive, have advised, aided, and encouraged the movement which terminated in forming what they call a constitution and a State. General Riley, who professed to act as civil Governor, called the convention, determined on the number and distribution of the delegates, appointed the time and place of its meeting, was present during the session, and gave its proceedings his approbation and sanction. If he acted without authority, he ought to have been tried, or, at least, reprimanded and disarmed. Neither having been done, the presumption is that his course has been approved. This, of itself, is sufficient to identify the Executive with his acts, and to make it responsible for them. I touch not the question whether General Riley was appointed, or received the instructions under which he professed to act, from the present Executive or its predecessor. If from the former, it would implicate the preceding as well as the present administration. If not, the responsibility rests exclusively on the present.

It is manifest, from this statement, that the Executive Department has undertaken to perform acts, preparatory to the meeting of the individuals, to form their so called constitution and State government, which appertain exclusively to Congress. Indeed, they are identical in many respects with the provisions adopted by Congress, when it gives permission to a territory to form a constitution and government, in order to be admitted as a State into the Union.

Having now shown that the assumption upon which the executive and the individuals in California acted, throughout this whole affair, is informal, unconstitutional, and dangerous, it remains to make a few remarks, in order to show that what has been done is contrary to the entire practice of government, from its commencement to the present time.

From its commencement until the time that Michigan was admitted, the practice was uniform. Territorial governments were first organized by Congress. The government of the United States appointed the governors, judges, secretaries, marshals, and other officers, and the inhabitants of the territory were represented by legislative bodies, whose acts were subject to the revision of Congress. This state of things continued until the government of a territory applied to Congress to permit its inhabitants to form a constitution and government, preparatory to admission into the Union. The preliminary act to giving permission, was to ascertain whether the inhabitants were sufficiently numerous to authorize them to be formed into a State. This was done by taking a census. That being done, and the number proving sufficient, permission was granted. The act granting it, fixed all the preliminaries—the time and place of holding the convention; the qualification of the voters; establishing its boundaries, and all other measures necessary to be settled previous to admission. The act giving permission necessarily withdraws the sovereignty of the United States, and leaves the inhabitants of the incipient State as free to form their constitution and government as were the original States of the Union after they had declared their independence.

At this stage, the inhabitants of the territory became for the first time a people, in legal and constitutional language. Prior to this, they were, by the old acts of Congress, called inhabitants, and not people. All this is perfectly consistent with the sovereignty of the United States, with the powers of Congress, and with the right of a people to self-government.

Michigan was the first case in which there was any departure from the uniform rule of acting. Here was a very slight departure from established usage. The ordinance of '87 secured to her the right of becoming a State, when she should have 60,000 inhabitants. Owing to some neglect, Congress delayed taking the census. In the meantime, her population increased until it clearly exceeded more than twice the number, which entitled her to admission. At this stage, she formed a constitution and government without the census being taken by the United States, and Congress received the admission without going through the formality of taking it, as there was no doubt she had more than a sufficient number to entitle her to admission. She was not admitted at the first session she applied, owing to some difficulty respecting the boundary between her and Ohio. The great irregularity, as to her admission, took place at the next session, but on a point which can have no possible connection with the case of California.

The irregularity in all other cases that have since occurred, are of a similar character. In all, there existed territorial governments, established by Congress, with officers appointed by the United States. In all, the territorial government took the lead in calling conventions, and fixing preliminaries preparatory to the formation of a constitution and admission into the Union. They all recognized the sovereignty of the United States, and the authority of Congress over the territories; and whenever there was any departure from the established usage, it was done on the presumed consent of Congress, and not in defiance of its authority, or the sovereignty of the United States over the territories. In this respect, California stands alone, without usage, or a single example to cover her case.

It belongs now, Senators, for you to decide what part you will act in reference to this unprecedented transaction. The Executive has laid the paper purporting to be the constitution of California before you, and asks you to admit her into the Union as a State, and the question is, will you or will you not admit her? It is a grave question, and there rests upon you a heavy responsibility. Much, very much, will depend upon your decision. If you admit her, you endorse and give your sanction to all that has been done. Are you prepared to do so? Are you prepared to surrender your power of legislation for the territories—a power expressly vested in Congress by the consitution, as has been fully established? Can you, consistent with your path to support the constitution, surrender it? Are you prepared to admit that the inhabitants of the territories possess the sovereignty over them; and that any number, more or less, may claim any extent of territory they please; may form a constitution and government, and erect it into a State, without asking your permission? Are you prepared to surrender the sovereignty of the United States over whatever territory may be hereafter acquired, to the first adventurers who may rush into it? Are you prepared to surrender virtually to the Executive department all the powers which you have heretofore exercised over the territories? If not, how can you, consistently with your duty, and your oath to support the constitution, give your assent to the admission of California as a State, under a pretended constitution and government? Can you believe adopted, has the least validity? Can you believe, that there is such a State in reality, as the State of California? No: there is no such State. It has no legal or constitutional existence. It has no validity, and can have none, without your sanction. How, then, can you admit it as a State, when, according to the provisions of the constitution, your power is limited to admitting new States? That is, they must be States, existing States, independent of your sanction, before you can admit them. When you give your permission to the inhabitants of a territory to form a constitution and a State, the constitution and State they form derive their authority from the people, and not from you. The State before admitted, is actually a State, and does not become so by the act of admission, as would be the case with California, should you admit her contrary to constitutional provisions and established usage heretofore.

The Senators on the other side of chamber must permit me to make a few remaks in this connection particularly applicable to them. With the exception of a few Senators from the South, sitting on that side of the chamber, when the Oregon question was before this body, not two years since, you took, if I mistake not, universally, the ground, that Congress had the sole and absolute power of legislating for the territories. How, then, can you now, after the short interval which has elapsed, abandon the ground which you then took, and thereby virtually admit that the power of legislating, instead of being in Congress, is in the inhabitants of the territories? How can you justify and sanction by your votes the acts of the Executive, which are in direct derogation of what you then contended for? But, to you, after condemning, little more than a year since, the grounds taken by the party which you defeated at the last election, wheel round and support by your votes the grounds which, as explained by the candidate of the party at the last election, are identical with those on which the Executive has acted in reference to California. What are we to understand by all this? Must we conclude that there is no sincerity, no faith, in the acts and declarations of public men, and that all is mere acting or hollow profession? or are we to conclude that the exclusion of the South from the territories acquired from Mexico is an object of so paramount a character in your estimation, that right, justice contstiution, and consistency must all yield, when they stand in the way of our exclusion?

But, it may be asked, what is to be done with California, should she not be admitted? I answer, remand her back to the territorial condition, as was done in the case of Tennessee, in the early stage of the government. Congress, in in her case, had established a territorial government, in the usual form, with a governor, judges, and other officers appointed by the United States. She was entitled under the deed of cession to be admitted into the Union as a State, as soon as she had 60,000 inhabitants. The territorial government believing it had that number, took a census, by which it appeared it exceeded it. She then formed a constitution and a State, and applied for admission. Congress refused to admit her, on the ground that the census should be taken by the United States, and that Congress had not determined whether the territory should be divided into one or two States as it was authorized to do, under the cession. She returned quietly to her territorial condition. An act was passed to take a census by the United States, and providing that the territory should form one State. All afterwards was regularly conducted, and the territory admitted as a State in due form. The irregularities in the case of California are immeasurably greater, and afford a much stronger reason for pursuing the same course. But, it may be said, California may not submit. That is not probable: but, if she should not, when she refuses, it will then be time for us to decide what is to be done.

Having now shown what cannot save the Union, I return to the question with which I commenced—How can the Union be saved? There is but one way by which it can, with any certainty, be saved, and that is by a full and final settlement, on the principles of justice, of all the questions at issue between the two sections. The South asks for justice, simple justice, and less she ought not to take. She has no compromise to offer but the constitution, and no concession or surrender to make. She has already surrendered so much, that she has little left to surrender. Such a settlement would go to the root of the evil—remove all cause of discontent, and satisfy the South that she could remain honestly and safely in the Union, and thereby restore the harmony and fraternal feelings between the sections, which existed anterior to the Missouri agitation. Nothing else can, with any certainty, finally and forever settle the question at issue, terminate agitation, and save the Union.

But can this be done? Yes easily; not by the weaker party for it can of itself do nothing—not even protect itself—but by the stronger. The North has only to will, to do justice, and perform her duty, in order to accomplish it—to do justice by conceding to the South an equal right in the acquired territory; and to do her duty by causing the stipulations relative to fugitive slaves to be faithfully fulfilled—to cease the agitation of the slave question, and provide for the insertion of a provision in the constitution, by an amendment, which will restore in substance the power she possessed of protecting herself before the equilibrium between the sections were destroyed by the action of this government. There will be no difficulty in devising such a provision—one that will protect the South, and which at the same time will improve and strengthen the government, instead of impairing or weakening it.

But will the North agree to do this? It is for her to answer this question. But I will say, she cannot refuse, if she has half the love of the Union she professes to have, or without justly exposing herself to the charge that her love of power and aggrandizement is far greater than her love of the Union. At all events, the responsibility of saving the Union is on the North, and not the South. The South cannot save it by any act of hers, and the North may save it without any sacrifice whatever, unless to do justice and perform her duties under the constitution be regarded by her as a sacrifice.

It is time, Senators, that there should be an open and manly avowal on all sides as to what is intended to be done. If the question is not now settled, it is uncertain whether it ever can hereafter be, and we as the representatives of the States of this Union, regarded as governments, should come to a distinct understanding as to our respective views, in order to ascertain whether the great questions at issue between the sections can be settled or not. If you, who represent the stronger portion, cannot agree to settle them on the broad principle of justice and duty, say so, and let the States we represent agree to separate and part in peace. If you are willing that we should part in peace, tell us so, and we shall know what to do when you reduce the question to submission or resistance. If you remain silent, you then compel us to infer what you intend. In that case California will become the test question. If you admit her under all the difficulties that oppose her admission, you compel us to infer, that you intend to exclude us from the whole of the acquired territories, with the intention of destroying irretrievably the equilibrium between the two sections. We would be blind, not to perceive, in that case, that your real objects are power and aggrandizement; and infatuated not to act accordingly.

I have now, Senators, done my duty in expressing my opinions fully, freely and candidly on this solemn occasion. In doing so I have been governed by the motives which have governed me in all the stages of the agitation of the Slavery question since its commencement; and exerted myself to arrest it with the intention of saving the Union, if it could be done: and, if it cannot, to save the section where it pleased Providence to cast my lot, and which I sincerly believe has justice and the constitution on its side.—Having faithfully done my duty to the best of my ability, both to the Union and my section, throughout the whole of this agitation, I shall have the consolation, let what will come, that I am free from all responsibility.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1850.

Mr. Webster and Slavery.

The great hierophant has at last opened his mouth. The mysteries of the Holy of Holies of Whiggery are unfolded. It is of more than the Constitution that Mr. Webster is the Great Expounder. He has revealed the *arcana* of Taylordom. The uninitiated, the Whigs that stand on the outer degrees of the Temple, as well as the Gentiles without, are taught by his oracular responses what is the meaning of the doctrines which they have been boasting for their heritage as a people zealous of good works. The text which has passed through so many editions from Plymouth Rock down to Springfield is now elucidated and put beyond cavil or controversy by the comments of the Author himself. The Anti-Slavery professions of Mr. Webster and his party are brought to the test, returned to the Mint, by himself, and are plainly and undeniably shown to be base coin. The great question now is whether the party whose image and superscription it bears will nail it to the counter, or get it to pass unquestioned as current money of the merchant. The debasement of the currency has always been looked upon as a stain on the memory of any monarch that has resorted to it. Whether that portion of our Allied Sovereigns bearing the style of Northern Whigs will consent to this depreciation of their circulating medium, remains to be seen. We rather incline to the opinion that, like a prudent segment of a shepherding nation, they will say little about it for the present; but, as soon as suspicion is a little allayed, pass it off mixed up with a handful of lawful money upon any raw customer that may have dealings with them. Let all beware of counterfeits, for such are abroad.

The Abolitionists, it is well known, have ever been shrewdly suspicious of the Anti-Slavery protestations of the Whigs. They have regarded them as a prudent nation of mice might the meal in which Grimalkin had rolled herself that she might take them at unawares. Or as the same discreet people might a savoury piece of toasted cheese fitly placed to lure them to a wire-drawn death. They ever had a violent suspicion that it was bait and bait only,—sprats ventured to catch gudgeons. This has always been a ground of complaint against us. We have been censured for intolerance because we hesitated to yield ourselves to the voice of the Charmer so wisely charming through the miraculous organ of Mother Goose, affectionately inviting the ducks "to come and be killed." We have been condemned as narrow-minded and bigotted, because we have declined running about the streets, like the roasted pigs in Cockayne, with knives and forks sticking in our sides, vociferating "come eat me, come eat me!" And Wisdom has been, in this case, as in all others, justified of her children. Though, like other prophets, we are without honour in our own country, it cannot well be affirmed that it is because we have prophesied vain things. It is, on the contrary, because we have always spoken the words of truth and soberness, and our predictions have all been regularly turned into history, that we have been rejected of a perverse and stiff-necked generation and which loved a lie better than the truth. But whether cause or effect, our estimates of the calibre of public men and of the course of public events have scarcely ever been contradicted by ultimate facts.

If there be a single principle which the Northern Whigs blazoned on their banners when they went up to the help of Taylor against the mighty, it was that of the Non-extension of Slavery, as embodied in the Wilmot proviso. Even the Olympian Jove of the party himself, claimed it as a portion of his attributive thunder, and jealously wrested it from the grasp of the young Titans of Free Soil, who had undertaken to thunder and lighten a little on their own account. To be sure, nobody recollected the crash of his celestial artillery or remembered the confusion and flight of his enemies; but, then, nobody grudged him the credit of the invention, provided he put it to its proper uses. But there was a strong inclination to believe, on the part of the unbelievers, that this thunder was, after all, only a Brummagem imitation of the genuine article, like that of the mythical tyrant who endeavoured to make a bridge of *brass* a substitute for the resounding bolts of the Thunderer. And the last week proved these infidels to be the only true believers, after all. For, when all men were looking to see the great Discoverer of this forked thunderbolt hurl it at the heads of his enemies, scatter them with unutterable confusion, and heap mountains of scorn and wrath upon their heads, lo! they find that the weapon he has so bragged of is as harmless as the bird-bolt of Cupid, a toy which he had brandished merely to amuse and decoy the infants of his political family! At the very moment when the battle is joined, and the Giants are scaling the serene heights of his Olympus, Mr. Jupiter lays down his patent thunder, assures his invaders that it is quite superfluous, and begs them to understand that he would by no means "use it needlessly to wound their feelings!"

This country has witnessed its fair share of political tergiversations; but all the tergiversations it has yet seen were straight-forward and direct marches to the point, compared to that by which Mr. Webster has turned his back upon the Wilmot Proviso. Many a specimen of ground and lofty tumbling has been presented in the political Ring at Washington; but no harlequin there has ever yet turned so agile or so complete a somerset as has the Godlike Defender of the Constitution. But though nimbly and completely thrown it was done with a very bad grace, after all. It was clumsily and awkwardly done, as became so scurvy a trick. Mr. Webster tramples the life out of the Wilmot Proviso (his own child, if we may believe his own boasts) because he thinks it "useless and nugatory," from the "law of Nature which has placed impassible barriers to its introduction" into the Mexican territories! Did he not know this when he was picking Mr. Wilmot's pocket of his Proviso, adding it to his own capital, and proclaiming that it should be forever the rule of his political action? Has he gained any new geographical ideas since he and his party went for Taylor *and* the Wilmot Proviso? Has Nature changed her laws or Mr. Webster his mind, since the campaign of 1848? Does Mr. Webster believe that those territories are more unfitted for a Slave population than Maryland, Kentucky, large portions of North Carolina, Virginia and other States? Does he not know that Slavery exists mainly because of the political power it bestows and not of the wealth it creates? What but direct prohibition has excluded Slavery from large portions of the North West territory? And if the proviso be nugatory, it can do no harm. Would Mr. Webster exclude from his beloved Constitution of the United States, everything that he regards as self-evident and axiomatic? But forsooth, when Canada applies for admission, some fanatic may propose such a prohibition of Slavery, there! And why not, we should like to know? Why not forbid Slavery by legislation from Greenland and Spitzbergen, if they ever apply for Annexation? But how base is this attempt to confound the ideas of the Nation by the implication that there is any similitude or analogy between the natural obstacles presented to the spread of Slavery by the hyperborean winters of Canada and the tropical summers of Northern Mexico!

Not less base, but more inhuman, are his prostrations before the Slave Power, on the subject of the rendition of fugitive slaves. He thinks the North wrong and the South right in this controversy! It is a jurt cause of complaint, and one which *the North ought to remove*. "The duty was imposed by the Constitution, and it was not *consistent with morality* for Northern men and legislatures to attempt to evade this provision!" Now what has any Northern legislature ever done? Has any one ever forbidden the recapture of a slave or punished a pursuing master, or an assisting citizen, as a felon? Alas, no! All the most extreme has done has been to forbid the use of their gaols, and the services of their magistrates and officers, by the slave-hunter.—And this, according to the letter of the construction of the Constitution by the Supreme Court! Would Mr. Webster change this legislation? Would he have the prisons and the officials of Massachusetts made the cages and the bloodhounds of the hunter of men? Is he not contented with his own Constitution, as expounded by its own Slaveholding Judges, and would he give the Southern Shylocks additional security for their pound of flesh? If so, there is no depth of degradation to which even American politicians have ever plunged that will not open a yet lower deep of infamy to receive the Defender of the rights of tyrants! He professes his design of voting for Mr. Mason's law giving additional means to the man-hunter, and repudiates all obligation to regard the resolutions of his Legislature, if they effect the interests of the South! These are the opinions, this the "morality" of this the foremost man of all the Whig world! Does he fitly represent it? Are they all ready to fall down with their Chief Priest and do homage to the ugly Monster he thinks it immoral to incommode?

This question we suppose will soon be settled. Mr. Webster's speech excited a strong sensation throughout Massachusetts, even in Boston, and men blessed the invention of the Telegraph, which gave them an excuse for delay in the formation and expression of their opinions. What views the men who hold in their hands the strings of the Whig Puppet-show, will take of this their chief performer, must soon evolve. There are those who think that they will renounce and denounce him, and leave him to such consolation as he can derive from the proffered hand of Mr. Calhoun, or the reported promise of Mr. Foote that he should be raised to the Presidency by the South West, as his reward. But we fear that he will be sustained by the authority of the Whig party, and that the Free Soil party has not energy enough to make the use of it which might breathe a soul under the ribs of their living death. We can only say that if Massachusetts submit in patience to this insult to herself, she is self-stultified, indeed, and that the signal examples she made of Mason, of Boston, and Shaw, of Lanesboro', in 1820, will be blotted out in her submission to the more damning ignominy of 1850. For surely the acts of those men are white as wool when contrasted with the scarlet infamy of Daniel Webster.

E. Q.

☞ It is not improper that we should copy the following Address, published by the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, in the last No. of the *Freeman*. We know that the feeling is not an uncommon one that there is no need of doing any thing for the Standard, that even to subscribe for it, with a motive for its support, is quite unnecessary, and that its circulation is so well taken care of by a few persons upon whom that duty officially devolves, that there is no Anti-Slavery obligation anywhere else to procure for it a single subscriber. We should be glad to correct this impression which interferes not a little with the usefulness of the paper. There is not, that we know of, any dissatisfation with the manner in which the paper is conducted; we are assured, on the contrary, not unfrequently and not only by friends, but by those also who are entire strangers to us, except that their names stand on our mail-books, that it is held by them in far higher estimation than ordinary newspapers; and our exchange papers, sometimes not specially friendly to the purpose of its publication, bare willing testimony to its literary value. 'Unequalled in the choice of its literary selections' says a Vermont paper published within the week, and 'it is to my taste the best in the United States' writes a subscriber, who is personally unknown to us, in a letter now before us; such testimony we might often quote did we think it worth while thus to blazon what others deem the merit of the paper.

But such being the estimation in which the paper is held, and confident as we are that it is exerting an abiding influence for the Cause, we submit whether its friends are doing all they should, for the Cause's sake, to render that influence wider and better. Our meagre subscription list is evidence enough that the Executive Committee of the Society cannot unaided give to the Standard the circulation that it ought to have, and that they do not receive the aid they should in their unwearied efforts from other subscribers. One of the members of the Committee—now abroad—did, at one time, and with no very great expenditure of time and effort procure an addition of nearly a hundred names to our list, many of which still remain upon it, and another, in a country-town in Massachusetts, appointed himself a local Committee, obtained a list of about twenty in his own village, which for two or three years he has kept good. We would hold up such examples to others, certain that like success would follow similar efforts. The claims of the Standard, we are confident need only to be presented to be recognized, and it is within the power of scores of our subscribers to increase, by personal efforts, its circulation in their own neighborhood, to such a degree that the paper shall be placed upon a firm foundation, and means which are now used for its support—but which withdrawn from it by its suspension, be it remembered, would no longer exist for the cause—might be devoted to the exigencies of the cause in other ways.

This much, at least, we are moved to say by way of second to the Address of the Pennsylvania Committee. Much more we might say, and with perfect propriety; but this, we hope, may induce some of our readers to add to their other efforts of serving the Slave, that of extending the circulation of the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and extending thus, in the most effectual way, the influence of the only body of men which for nearly twenty years has been devoted faithfully and unwaveringly to the immediate and unconditional Abolition of American Slavery.

Address of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society to the readers of *The Pennsylvania Freeman*.

Anti-Slavery Office.
Philadelphia, March 7th, 1850.

Respected Friends:—The object of this Address is to interest you in the New York *National Anti-Slavery Standard*, and to induce you, if possible, to subscribe for it. The reasons for your doing so are, in our judgment, so numerous and forcible, as to justify the belief that, if well considered, they cannot fail to have the desired effect. Among these reasons are—

1st. The ability with which the paper is conducted. Its Editors are ripe scholars and men of high literary attainments. Sydney Howard Gay has added to his many original qualifications for the post he occupies, the advantages of a six years' editorial experience. Edmund Quincy is one of the ablest writers in our country; and James Russell Lowell is too well known by his published works to make any commendation of him on our part necessary. A paper conducted by men of such character cannot but be, what it is, one of high literary order.

2d. Morally, its standard is equally high. Its Anti-Slavery fidelity is beyond all question. It is as true to its professed aim as the needle to the pole. It is fearless and impartial, and makes no compromise; choosing to incur the reputation of over-rigidity, rather than endanger the cause it advocates by any time-serving concessions.

3d. Its spacious columns furnish a weekly depository of all the important events that are transpiring relating to the slave question. In it may be found from week to week a current history of the Anti-Slavery enterprise. This history has an importance which few as yet fully appreciate, which is every day becoming more momentous, and with which every one should be acquainted.

4th. Besides its value as an Anti-Slavery journal, the paper is better worth the price of its subscription in a mere literary point of view, than many of our weekly publications making exclusive pretensions to that character. Its fourth page is made up with great taste and judgment, of selections from the best Foreign and American Periodicals. These selections are highly entertaining and instructive, and afford a fund of agreeable reading.

5th. The price of the paper is reasonable. It is $2 per annum, exclusive of the postage. Any one that will take the paper and read it regularly, will have received at the end of the year vastly more than an equivalent for his money. Each number of the paper contains matter enough to make a 12mo volume of 100 pages of fresh and valuable reading for the small sum of $2.

6th. The *Standard* deserves a much higher estimation, than that which is awarded to it, by many professed friends of the cause, in Pennsylvania. If the paper had been less bold, and unswerving in its opposition to sectarian apostacy, and political partyism, it might have had, at this time, more supporters. But it preferred principle to popularity, and the loss of subscribers to a sacrifice of its moral honesty. Had it preferred a different course, it would have been unworthy the support to which we now commend it.

7th. We have lately had some very strong testimonials to the value of the paper, and that too from persons who do not agree with it in all its principles. A letter received a few days since, from a physician of high standing in a neighboring town, holds the following language:

"I have been a reader of the '*Anti-Slavery Standard*,' for the last three years, and consider that besides being a bold and faithful advocate of the Anti-Slavery cause, it contains about the best history of the times, the reforms, and many improvements of the day, extant. Its miscellaneous reading is very interesting."

Another letter, subsequently received, from a respectable farmer in New Jersey, bears the following emphatic testimony:

"I have been a subscriber to the paper, since 1842, and have noted with pleasure its gradual improvement under its present editorship. As a reform, literary and miscellaneous paper, I think it is surpassed by none, and should its continuance depend on an increase of its subscription price, I should remain a subscriber. I should take the paper if it cost $5 a year."

Yet both of these gentlemen are voting men; at least they voted the Free-soil ticket at the late Presidential election.

8th. The paper is the organ of the American Anti-Slavery Society, and as such, has especial claims upon those who sustain, as do we of Pennsylvania, an auxiliary relation to that body. The American Society is the only National Anti-Slavery organization in the field. As an instrument for the overthrow of Slavery, we consider it invaluable. It deserves, and should receive the liberal support of every Abolitionist in the land. An easy way of contributing to its support, is to subscribe for its paper. If every Abolitionist in the State, who now takes the *Pennsylvania Freeman* were to become a subscriber also to the *Standard*—as might be done in each case with great personal advantage—the paper would be put on a permanent footing, the American Society's resources would be increased, and the Anti-Slavery cause in this State especially would be animated by a new life.

9th. Our appeal is not made to you on behalf of the conductors of the paper, but of those to whose interests it is exclusively devoted. We come in the name of the three millions of our fellow beings, held in Slavery, and ask that you will aid in sustaining in the field one of their most fearless champions. To these millions we all owe the most sacred obligations, and we submit to you whether in any other way, by the same expenditure of means, you can render their cause a more effectual service.

These are some of the considerations which, in our judgment, should induce you to subscribe to the *Standard*. We could offer others, if we had the space, but hardly think it necessary. We trust that what we have said, will have the effect desired, and that we shall receive directions from you forthwith, to put your names on the subscription list. Now is the opening of a new year, and a suitable time to begin. A letter addressed to J. M. McKim, 31 North 5th street, will be duly attended to.

The terms of the paper call for payment in advance, but if it should not suit you to forward the money now, send at a time when it will. We should rather wait to the end of the year, than not have your name.

Respectfully your friends,

JAMES MOTT, Chairman,
H. Wetherald, Secretary,
Of the Ex. Com. Pa. A. S. Society.

'However Bounded' Stanton.—The *Albany Atlas* comes to the rescue of H. B. Stanton, with a denial that he ever gave the 'patriotic' toast that we quoted a fortnight since. Why the *Atlas* should get up any indignation upon the matter, it would, perhaps, find hard to explain. For is not the Union a good thing? and does not the *Atlas* believe in it and bless it? If yea, why should Mr. Stanton be defended against the assertion that he gave such a toast as an injurious charge? May not he also be patriotic?

But see how unconsciously men bear testimony to the truth, though they may rather love a lie. Other men may love the Union, and praise it, and pray for it, and sing songs of joy and thanksgiving over it, but Mr. Stanton *has been* an Abolitionist, and so when he prefers the Union to Abolition, the Whigs hiss at him for a renegade and the Democrats deny his treachery! So plain is it to all men that a true Abolitionist is a Disunionist also.

However the *Atlas* suggests that all and several who have noticed this matter publish what Mr. Stanton really did say at Troy on the 22d ultimo, in a speech of the usual length, and not the short one called a toast. Here it is:

I have been called upon, during the evening, to respond to a sentiment in favor of the American Union. I know of but one question which now threatens the perpetuity of the Union, and that is the question of Slavery. My opinions on that subject are well known. I am supposed to be identified with the most radical of those who confine their opposition to this institution within the boundaries of the United States Constitution. While holding with unabated tenacity to all the sentiments I have ever expressed on this question, yet, so firm is my belief in the necessity of the existence of the union of these States to secure the rights of twenty millions of freemen within its borders, and to work out the ultimate peaceful emancipation of the three millions of slaves south of the Potomac, and to promote the cause of civil and religious liberty throughout the world, that I am ready to say now what I have always said, come Wilmot Proviso or no Wilmot Proviso, come Slavery prohibition or Slavery extension, I will go with anybody who is for, and will oppose everybody who is against "One Country, one Constitution, one Destiny."

—There; we give Mr. Stanton all the benefit that can be got out of such a correction. If it is any credit to him to be a lover of the Union while professing to be an Abolitionist, it is proved that he deserves it more than the toast claimed for him; if it is a disgrace, then he is more dishonored than even we, who have known him for years, thought it possible.

Preaching and Practice.—A correspondent of the *True Wesleyan* relates, in the last number of that paper, an incident which is in rather striking proof of the eminent piety which characterizes some American divines. We ought, however, to add, lest we should mislead our readers abroad, that Ministers of the Gospel of this sort are only found in the Southern States. Northern clergymen don't do these things; they only welcome to their pulpits as joint shepherds over the lambs of Christ those who do. Here is the story which, lest anybody should overlook it, we put in *leads. Irons* would be better, but printing was discovered before America, and the use to which type would be put was foreseen:

SHOCKING OUTRAGE.

"I write now to give you some account of a diabolical transaction that occurred in this vicinity last Sabbath, that is enough to shock the feelings of any civilized community, which you will please publish.

"On the day aforesaid, it was pronounced that 'Brother Mayhew,' a Local Preacher in the M. E. Church, from Kentucky, would preach in this place. Well, the day and hour arrived, and a large concourse of people gathered to hear him, as he had the reputation of being a great man. Well, he preached a good sermon, but it lost its good effect. After the sermon he deliberately walked from the stand to the outskirts of the congregation and laid hold of a colored sister in the church, who had a child of her own in her arms, and proceeded to draw a rope from his pocket to tie her, claiming at the same time that she was a fugitive slave of one of his neighbors, and saying that he was sent after her, and took this plan to find her, in order to secure the reward ($75,) offered for her. Upon remonstrance by some of the bystanders, he played the bravado by displaying sundry revolvers and bowie knives from his pockets, and stated that if any one would dare to interfere they would feel the effects of them, then deliborately put her in his buggie, tied her, and drove off. The woman, I learn, is a widow, and has resided in the county for several years.

"It is to be hoped that the authorities of Ohio, will hasten to demand the man as a kidnapper and bring him to justice."

"Yours, J. S.

"Antrim Guernsey Co. Ohio, Feb. 25th, 1850."

Slavery in Washington.

On the 5th instant, Mr. Hale, in the United States Senate, presented a variety of memorials against Slavery, which, of course, were not received. That from citizens of Newport, Herkimer co. N. Y. presents a sketch of the state of things in the Capital, which, though not new, may be profitably held up to view at this moment. They say:

"1st Daniel Drayton and —— Sayre are in prison in the District of Columbia, and they are to be kept there until they shall have done the impossible thing of paying $17,760, the amount of the fines so cruelly and wickedly imposed upon them. This is their doom, because these were found in the vessel which they navigated, 74 of their wretched fellow-beings, who were seeking to escape from Slavery. Because their judges, adopting the shameful and monstrous falsehood that Slavery has a legal existence in the District of Columbia, under our Anti-Slavery National Constitution, transmuted the merit of these two men into a high crime. With these Judges, who are guilty of being the servants of pirates, and of installing in the place of righteous and holy law the assumption of lawless piracy, what less should be done than to impeach them?

"Secretary Clayton is guilty of prostituting his high office to the service of slaveholding interest. His refusal to grant a 'passport or protection' to Henry Hambleton, a colored person, was based distinctly and solely on the ground of Mr. Hambleton's complexion. Is not Congress bound to provide efficiently against the repetition of this scandalous offense?

"3d. The Marshal of the District of Columbia makes rights turn upon complexion; and goes so far as to imprison or otherwise outrage colored persons, who, if they were but white persons, would be entirely unmolested by them. The charge is fully justified by his recent crime against Edward Brooks.

"4th. There are persons, even thousands of them, in the District of Columbia who are actually held as slaves: and they are claimed to be held under the laws of Congress. There are no laws of Congress authorizing Slavery. * * * How absurd the supposition that Congress can establish Slavery at West Point, or wherever it has a fort or arsenal! And yet, if Congress have power to establish Slavery in the District of Columbia, it has power to establish it wherever Congress has exclusive jurisdiction.

"We respectfully submit that Congress is bound to put an immediate end to Slavery in the District of Columbia, and to guard against its recurrence by the terrors of the highest penalties."

Let us add an item or two which come to us without seeking while this is under observation. They may serve to complete the picture. For instance a correspondent of the *Tribune* writing from Washington no longer ago than Wednesday of last week, describes a not uncommon sight there thus:

The day before yesterday I saw two white men riding in a buggy, with two women riding behind them, with their backs to the men, so placed that if they had moved, or neglected to hold on, they would have fallen off; they sat on the sharp corner of the seat. The vehicle was going over Seventh st. Bridge, toward the wharves. The women were just as they had been picked up from their daily labor, doubtless sold to the distant South, far from every creature they ever knew, and in all probability sent off without ten minutes warning. Those here who are used to this kind of work may like it; I cannot help wishing that it had ceased to exist. All I see of the colored population, satisfies me that their capacity for receiving instruction is good, and that their behavior, in very many cases, might put their traducers to shame.

Here, perhaps, are the very women advertized in customary connection in recent Nos. of the *Washington Intelligencer*, the organ of Mr. Webster's Anti-Slavery Whig party:

SALE, BY ORDER OF THE ORPHAN'S COURT, OF HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, &c., AT AUCTION. On Saturday Morning next, the 22d instant, at 10 o'clock, we shall sell, by order of the Orphan's Court, at the residence of Mrs. Stewart, on the corner of 14th and G streets, the Household and Kitchen Furniture; among which we enumerate, viz:

Marble-top Pier Table, Mahogany Sofas;
Mahogany Chairs and Rockers;
Do Dining Tables;
Do Bedsteads, Bureaus, Washstands;
Beds, Mattresses, Bedding, Lounges, &c.;
Morgen Window Curtains and Ornaments;
Dinner and Desert Sets, Glass Ware;
Parlor Chamber Carpets, Rush Chairs, &c.;
With a general assortment of Kitchen Requisites.

At 12 o'clock, M., we shall also *sell two Negro Women and one Negro Man, with a small lot of prime Hams*

Terms cash. EWD. C. & G. F. DYER,
dec 18—d Auctioneers.

N. B.—Owing to the unpleasant state of the weather on Saturday last, the above sale will take place on Friday morning, the 22th instant. E. C. & G. F. DYER,
dec 21—td Auctioneers.

Happy Republic! Glorious Union! Most Christian people!

☞ Some of the correspondents of the *Journal of Commerce* are puzzling themselves over Mr. Webster's statement as to the expenditures of the Abolitionists; one asserting that he only said they might have bought the slaves of Maryland, not those of the whole Union; and another, believing the latter to be the fact, proposes that a more wholesome state of public opinion be brought about, and the necessary twelve to fifteen hundred millions be raised immediately. The editor of the *Journal*, however, sets its readers right about the matter, and asserts "with great deference," "that Mr. Webster over-rates a hundred fold the expenditures made by the Abolitionists." You are right, neighbor, and are a living proof of it. Does anybody suppose that *you* would be pro-slavery if you believed the Abolitionists had any of the millions Mr. Webster talks about? Had we a hundredth part of the amount necessary to buy the slaves, there would be a marvellous change of opinion as to the sinfulness of Slavery, and the propriety of compensation—to slaveholders, that is—among your Websters and *Journals of Commerce*.

Mr. Webster's Thunder.—Who has forgotten its reverberations? Not a Whig paper in the land but handled the thunder-bolt as familiarly as the printer's do their composing-sticks. It was an implement every man loyal to the party was bound to carry about with him to knock everybody over the knuckles with who had the temerity to question Whig Anti-Slavery.

Hear the 'godlike' in his Springfield Speech in 1847:

"There is not a man in this hall who holds to the principles of the Wilmot proviso more firmly than I do, no one who adheres to it more than another. I feel some little interest in this matter, sir. Did I not commit myself in 1838 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permited to say, that I cannot quite consent that more recent discoverers should claim the merit and take out a patent. I deny the priority of their invention. Allow me to say, sir, it is not their thunder."

The New 'Boy.'—Mr. Webster may find no difficulty in getting a recommendation from his old place to his new masters, but if if he should it would be no matter. The *Washington Union* and the *New York Journal of Commerce* profess to have had their eyes him for a great while, and declare that such another excellent and faithful 'boy' could not have been found any where. He will command the best wages.

☞ It is not our choice that we are again, this week, editorially sandwiched between Congressional Speeches, which occupy nearly our whole paper, but our readers would have a right to complain of us if we did not let them know what the great party leaders are saying at Washington. We shall endeavor to do our part again toward bringing about the Abolition of Slavery when Messrs. Calhoun, Webster, and their compeers, shall rest from their temporary labors. As it is they have for the time being stolen our vocation.

☞ We are requested to state that absence from home and intefering circumstances otherwise, will delay Alpha's concluding number on Slave-labor Products.

To Correspondents.

M. F. Shall appear next week. We should have been obliged to omit it this, as he may see, even had it come earlier.

C. C. B. Shall hear by mail as soon as possible. His request shall be attended to.

J. B. The paper is paid for by S. B. to No. 458—about the 1st of May.

E. G. Package at 21.

Congressional.

The great event of the past week in Washington is the Speech of Mr. Webster, the annexed report of which, though not full, contains without doubt the gist of it, we copy from *The* (Washington) *Republic*:

SENATE.... MARCH 7th.

COMPROMISE RESOLUTIONS.

Mr. Walker said he knew the immense audience present was not assembled to hear him, and he knew that there was but one man whom they expected to hear.—Whatever rights he had to the floor, he willingly conceded them to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Webster said that he felt himself under a deep obligation to the Senators from Wisconsin (Mr. Walker) and New York (Mr. Seward) for their courtesy in allowing him to address the Senate to-day. He wished to speak to-day not as a Senator from Massachusetts, nor as a northern man, but as an American, and as a member of the American Senate. He thought it was fortunate for the country that there was a Senate—that there was a body which had not yet been moved from its propriety, not yet lost to a just sense of its own dignity and high self-respect—a body to which the country looked with confidence for wise and patriotic action.

It was not to be denied that we live in the midst of strong agitation, and of considerable danger to the institutions of our government. The imprisoned winds have been let loose from the North, the East, the West, and the stormy South, and they are tossing the ocean billows to the skies, and expose to our gaze the profoundest depths. He did not feel that he was the suitable person to take the helm in this storm, nor had he the skill to combat the elements. But he had a duty to perform—not a duty for his own security or safety, nor to look for a fragment on which to float from the wreck if wreck should ensue—but a duty to perform to the whole country, and for the good of the whole country. There was that which should keep him to his duty during the struggle and the storm, whether the sun or the stars shall or shall not appear for several days; it was the preservation of the Union. He spoke to-day for the preservation of the Union. Hear me for my cause.

He spoke to-day for the American heart; for the preservation of peace, concord, harmony and fraternal feeling, which are what renders this Union so dear to all. Believe me, for mine honor. These were the sole motives which governed him in giving his opinions to the Senate and the country.

It might not be amiss to recur briefly to the events, equally sudden and extraordinary, which have brought the political condition of the country to its present state.

In May, 1846, war was declared with Mexico. The American troops crossed the line of the enemy's territory, invaded her provinces and finally took possession of her capital. The marine forces of the United States took possession of her ports on the Atlantic and Pacific. In less than two years from the commencement of the war, a treaty was made, by which Mexico ceded to the United States the territories on the Pacific. It had so happened that, in consequence of the distracted and enfeebled state of Mexico before the war was known in California, the people there, under the supposed lead of American officers, had overthrown the provincial government, and run up an independent flag. When the news of the existence of the war reached there, the independent flag was torn down and the stars and stripes hoisted in its stead. Before the war was over, our forces had possession of San Francisco, and a great rush of emigrants from all parts took place to California. In January, 1848, the Mormons discovered an extraordinary rich mine or quantity of gold at the lower part of the American branch of the Sacramento. This was kept secret for some time; but eventually it became known. Not long after this gold was discovered in a higher branch of the Sacramento river. The fame of this discovery was spread abroad, and population crowded into the country in flocks. This all took place in the winter of '48. The digging did not commence until the spring of '48, and since then gold-digging has been prosecuted with a success hither

recognized; they argued that by that law captives taken in war might be held till ransomed; or they might in exchange for death, voluntarily become slaves; and that their condition as slaves descended to their posterity. They also held that a man might voluntarily sell himself to another, as a slave, for debt; and thirdly, that persons could be made laves for crimes.

At the introduction of Christianity, the Roman world was full of slaves; and no injunction against that condition of man was found in the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ or any of his apostles The object of instituting, of founding Christianity, was to touch the heart and improve the mind of man. Its object was to operate on the individual heart and mind of man.

Now, on the general nature and character of Slavery, there is a wide difference of opinion between the northern and the southern portions of the country.

On the one side, at the North, it was held, even in the absence of injustice to be a right founded in power and might over feebleness, and Slavery is held not to be in accordance with the meek spirit of the Gospel. These are sentiments cherished recently with augmented force by the people of the Northern States, and it has taken hold of and pervades their religious feelings

The South, on the other side, treating their slaves with the utmost kindness and consideration, have been taught with the Greeks to look upon the African as an inferior creature, whose natural state is bondage. There are, at the South, thousands of men who, having consciences as tender and as upright as any at the North, cannot take the Northern view of this subject. There are others who look upon things as they are, and without inquiring further, declare, conscientously, that they have neither the responsibility or the power to free themselves of the institution

The Senator from Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun) the other day alluded to the separation of the Methodist Episcopal church This separation took place on this subject of Slavery. He had examined the subject, had looked at the separation with anxiety, for he looked upon that denomination as one of the great props of religion and morality of the whole people; he had read all the arguments on both sides, but never had been able to see any good cause for the separation, nor that any good could result from it.

When questions of this kind take hold of the religious mind, and creep into religious assemblages, they must lead to excitement. All history shows that religious disputes lead to war. Upon all such subjects and in all such controversies, men think themselves absolutely right, and all others differing from them, as absolutely wrong, and mark out a strong line between what they think right and what they think wrong. There are men who cannot see that in too hotly pursuing one truth, they are apt to fall into many errors. They are disposed to mount this one duty as a war-horse, and ride upon it over all others. They deal with morals as with mathematics; and think that morals are as easily demonstrated as an algebraical proposition. They think that if in their perspicacious vision they behold a spot upon the sun, the sun should be stricken down; they would prefer to be in total darkness rather than receive light from an imperfect orb. Others there are who are too impatient for the slow process of moral effects. They forget that the truths and the miracles of Jesus Christ were preached, and yet how few converted; and they forget also, that even in Christian lands how frequent are vices and crimes—and that between nations professing the truths of Christianity, how wars, unjust wars, are waged.

In all this lies a great cause of the dissensions and exasperations existing amongst us.

Slavery does exist in the United States, and did exist in the States before and at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. He proposed to show what was the state of public sentiment in relation to it, at the North and at the South, at that time, and what the great and wise men of all parts of the country thought of it in 1787. At that time there was no great diversity of opinion, and it will be found that both parties—South and North—held Slavery to be a great moral and political evil. Not much, though some invective against it as a cruel condition was uttered; but the great objection was, it being a political evil, as taking the place of free labor; as a labor which was less strong and less productive. All held it to be an evil, and ascribed it justly to the evil policy of the mother country, who entailed it on the colonies. Eminent men held it to be a blight, a mildew, a scourge, a curse; and the North was not then so excited against it as the South.

This was the light in which the convention which formed the Constitution held it. The question then was how to deal with the evil. They thought Slavery could not continue if they prohibited the importation Hence a limit to importation of slaves was proposed. Twenty years was proposed by a Northern man. Southern gentlemen opposed that as being too long.

The term "Slavery," nor "fugitive slaves," is not used in the Constitution. "Persons bound to servitude," is the term used, Mr. Madison said the word was not recognized by the Constitution

The Convention met in Philadelphia, and sat from May to September, 1787. Congress was, during the whole time, in session at New York. All the great men of the country were in either one or the other body. A few perhaps held seats in both

It was in the summer of 1787, and while the convention was framing the Constitution, that Congress was framing the Ordinance of '87. There was a perfect concurrence between the two bodies. The Ordinance applied to all the territory then belonging to the United States, being that northwest of the river Ohio.

Virginia had a few years previously ceded to the United States all this territory. It was a magnanimous act. It was one of the fairest claims of Virginia to our respect and gratitude, and only second to that other claim, that from her counsels and from her statesmen first emanated the idea of forming a general Constitution.

This Ordinance was in full operation when the Constitution was adopted and the government put into operation in 1789.

It was clear as an historical truth, that at the framing of the Constitution it was the general expectation that upon the ceasing of importation of slaves, Slavery in the country would begin to run out. It was also an historical truth that so far as power existed in the Congress to prohibit the spread of Slavery in the United States, that power was exercised to the fullest extent.

The Senator from Carolina had said that this ordinance was the first of the series of deprivations of the privileges and equalities of the South, but that it was done by the confederation. It was the act of the confederation, but was done with the concurrence of the whole South. The ordinance was adopted by an unanimous vote of the Southern States, and the only vote against it was a Northern one.—Here he might pause and reflect on the perfect accord in the opinion of the North and South on this subject at that time.

But opinion had changed both at the North and the South. Slavery was not now considered at the South as an evil. Soon after these events, a change in opinion began, and a severance of opinion showed itself—the North growing more strong and warm against Slavery, the South more strong and warm in favor of it. What has been the cause of the change in the opinion of the South? a change which has given Slavery a new nomenclature? It is now an institution, and not a scourge—not a curse. He supposed it to be owing to the sudden rising and rapid growth of the cotton-planting interest. It was this gave the desire to increase the slave labor, and to spread it.

In 1790-'91, the exports of cotton were not more, annually, than forty or fifty thousand dollars; now, perhaps, it is a hundred millions a year. At that time, there was more wax, indigo and rice raised than cotton. It was not believed in England that any cotton was raised; and Mr. Jefferson says, that after the treaty by which American produce was allowed to be carried to England in American vessels, a vessel loaded with cotton was denied permission to land by the officers of the custom-house; they declaring that cotton was not raised in this country.

They know better now. The age of cotton has been a golden age to the South. It has excited a desire which has grown on what it fed upon, and soon it became the rage for new area of territory to raise cotton.

In 1802, Alabama was added to the confederacy. In 1803, Louisiana, including what now compose the slave States of Missouri and Arkansas. In 1819, Florida was purchased; and here was more slaveholding territory.

The senator from South Carolina said that he had seen in the policy of the Government, in the mode of regulating the revenue causes for the more rapid growth of the North. This may be so. But if any operation of government can be shown to increase the population and growth of the North, it can be nothing to the operations of the government to promote slave territory. It was not the operations of time that brought in Florida and Louisiana, but the acts of man. And among these acts of man might be included the annexation of Texas in 1845. This last closed the chapter and settled the account, for the annexation of Texas by the resolutions adopted did not leave one acre of land that was not settled as slave territory. By these resolutions it was guarantied by law.

There was not a foot of land in the United States the character of which, as far Slavery or free soil was concerned, which was not settled firmly by high and irrepealable laws. At the time of the annexation of Texas, the Senator from South Carolina was at the head of the State Department; there was then in the Senate, a gentleman remarkable for his activity and adroitness, who has since been Secretary of the Treasury, (Mr. Walker,) and between them both they had settled the character of the territory of Texas for all time It was neatly done—a close piece of joiner's work.

Mr. W. read that part of the resolutions of annexation of Texas particularly referring to new slave States to be marked out of her territory with her consent, and making this a part of the compact.

He said that by these resolutions it was solemnly secured that out of the territory of Texas, new States to the number of four may be formed, those south of 36 deg. 30 min to be slave States, those north to be free. No act of Congress can add strength to this guarantee Texas accepts the terms and comes in upon them. He saw no way in which the government can release itself from this obligation. Slavery was fixed there by positive guarantee."

The resolutions provide that free States can be formed north of 36 deg. 30 min.; but the consent of Texas is required. How could such a compact be formed if the North had the overshadowing power which the Senator from South Carolina says it had?

In the House of Representatives these resolutions were adopted by eighty southern and fifty northern votes. In the Senate, by a vote of twenty-seven to twenty-five. Of this twenty-seven, thirteen were from the free States—four were from New England. Nearly one-half of the vote was Free Soil votes. He knew nothing so remarkable in history as this affair. This territory of Texas—over which a bird could not fly in a week—annexed, and positively guarantied to be slave territory, and three-fourths of the liberty-loving members of the House from Connecticut, and one-half in the Senate voted for it. One vote was given for it from Maine, one from Massachusetts. These men called themselves the Northern Democracy. They went for the acquisition of territory, they went for the introduction of a new world, and after its introduction they propose to apply to it the saving grace of the Wilmot proviso.

Two Senators—one from Connecticut and one from New York—voted for the resolutions of annexation, with their eyes wide open to the fact that the then Secretary of State had openly and with smallness advocated its annexation because of its being slave territory.

Mr. Calhoun said that Great Britain, with the aid of Abolitionists here, was endeavoring to abolish Slavery in Texas. It was on this ground he advocated its annexation. Mr. Webster said it was nearly the same thing. Those two Senators who had voted to annex Texas—who had voted for acquiring new territory—have gone home to lead the great Free Soil party. They had left to the Senate the odium of voting to carry into effect the guarantee to admit new slave States, or the greater odium to vote to violate that guarantee, while they have gone home and are now engaged in making flaming Free Soil speeches.

Mr. W. then gave a history of his course on the subject of the annexation of Texas, and on the principles of the Wilmot proviso, showing that, from the year 1836, he had uniformly opposed the former and sustained the latter; reading from speeches delivered on these subjects. He had voted against the bill to consummate the annexation of Texas. He had been always opposed to the annexation, accession, or acquisition of territory north or south; he always adopted the Spartan maxim, "Improve, adorn what you have, seek no further."

But in the present state of affairs, he could see no other mode of proceeding, than to carry out the guarantees of the Texas annexation resolutions, whenever the proper time comes. He may not be there, but he wished it to be understood that this government is bound to admit new States out of Texas territory; and out of the territory 36 deg. 30 min. admit them as slave States. That was the meaning of the compact made by the northern Democracy. He would carry it out.

In his opinion Slavery could not exist in California and New Mexico, at least as it exists in this country. It was as impossible to carry Slavery there as it was to do any other natural impossibility. Mr. W. described the soil and character of the country, and held that no slaveholder would carry his slaves to such a country. It was a fixed fact that California and New Mexico were destined to be free, and that too by the arrangements of things by the power above. If a law was now before the Senate providing a territorial government for New Mexico, he would vote for no prohibition of Slavery. He would make no effort to carry out by law an ordinance of nature, or to reenact the will of God. He would not vote for it in such a case, because it was wounding to the feelings of Southern gentlemen who hold opinions that they are theoretically at least allowed to carry their slaves there.

He would treat the Wilmot proviso, as far as New Mexico was concerned, as Mr. Polk did it with regard to Oregon, that is, as a nugatory act, and in that case a senseless act Any man who would vote for the Wilmot proviso for New Mexico, should feel himself bound to protect the eternal snows of Canada from Slavery, by the same overshadowing wing of an act of Congress. When anything practical was to be effected, he might vote for it, but would give no vote to disgrace his own understanding.

In these times of excitement it is but natural that mutual criminations should take place, and that each side should have a list of grievances. He would begin the examination of these grievances with those of the South. One of these was founded upon true grounds. It is that the North have shown a disinclination to carry out the obligations of the Constitution in that particular requiring that fugitives from labor shall be rendered up. In this particular the South was right and the North was wrong. He considered by the terms of the Consitution, it was made the duty of the States and their Legislatures to give up these slaves. Every member of a State Legislature was bound by his oath to support the Constitution, and had no right to consider any excuse for not carrying all that Constitution into effect. There was a bill now before the Senate to carry into effect this provision of the Constitution, and he would vote for it. The South was right in its complaint on this point, and the North was wrong in being unmindful of what the Constitution peremptorily required of them.

Another subject of complaint was the resolutions sent here for instructions to members of Congress, some about Slavery in this District, or elsewhere. He thought that these resolutions by State Legislatures were become of two common occurrence He agreed with some sentiments uttered a few days ago in the Massachusetts Legislature by a young member, who said he would vote for no resolutions to be sent to the members of Congress. He saw no propriety in one set of public servants instructing another set; they were all public servants, and alike responsible to their constituents. He would be no more willing to listen to instructions from Massachusetts on a point where she was only as much interested as any other State, than he would, if appointed an arbitrator in a question of private right, listen to the instructions of the man who appointed him.

The Abolition societies at the North was another subject of complaint. He had no sympathies with these societies. They had had the effect of preventing any favorable coherence at the South in behalf of emancipation. Within the last twenty years he had no doubt that money enough had been contibuted to Abolition presses and societies to purchase the freedom of every slave in Maryland and send them to Liberia. He had yet to learn that Abolition philanthropy had taken that turn.

The South complained that the press of the North was directed against the institutions of the South. It was true that, in the northern papers, such charges and accusations were made, but in the South it was equally as bad. Indeed, some of the speeches and debates in Congress were but little improved and better than the tone of the press. Every sentiment uttered by the southern press, or by southern men, high or low, which reflected upon the North, was copied into the northern papers, and sent forth to a reading people, and produced a bad feeling. It was the same at the South. He saw no remedy in the power of Congress for this grievance. There were remarks in the speech of the Senator from Louisiana, (Mr. Downs) where he contrasted the laborers of the North with the slaves of the South. The northern laborers were the North. They owned four-fifths of the property at the North. They were an educated class, and any comparison such as that made by the Senator would go much to feed the excitement.

He would rather hear Senators all declare the impossibility of dissolving this Union, than that any one should say it could be done. He had heard of secession—peaceable secession! It was impossible. You might as well attempt to disturb the ocean to its depths without ruffling the surface. He was surprised to hear any foolish enough to suppose there could be a secession or dissolution without violence. Did Senators suppose this Union was like snow under a vernal sun, to be melted gently away? That these States were to part peacefully—make a concurrent agreement to separate—with alimony on both sides? He wanted to know where the flag was to go, where the eagle was to stand, or was he to cower and fall to the ground?

How was each State to protect itself? He had heard that a Southern Confederacy was to be formed. He did not charge any one with thinking of it. It was talked about. He was sorry it was talked about; he was sorry it was dreamed about. It was impossible to form a line between the slave and free States. A line could not be drawn that would be satisfactory to five men in the Union. He had a disgust for this subject. He would rather hear of a blight, mildew, a scourge—would rather hear of war, pestilence, and famine, than secession. There would be no disunion, no secession; but the Union would last, he hoped, forever.

He had heard of the Nashville Convention. He supposed, from what had been said, that it would be a convention to recommend conciliatory measures to the South and to the North. If not, and they were to meet with purposes adverse to the Union and Constitution, then they were singularly inappropriate in their selection of a place of meeting After the treaty of Amiens, a member of the British House of Commons, commenting upon it, said, that if King William could know what the treaty was, he would turn in his coffin. If this convention was to meet to take measures against this Union, the same emphatic remark might be made to them, that they were not in the proper place, when they held such councils over the soil where repose the remains of Andrew Jackson

He thought that if Texas would agree to cede to the United States all her territory north of the thirty-fourth parallel, for a money consideration, the proposition should be considered.

He would say to the gentlemen of the South that if they would propose a scheme for colonizing the free blacks of the South, on a large scale, he would vote for it He would vote to return to Virginia all the money received from the lands which she ceded to the United States to be applied to that purpose. Eighty millions of dollars had already been received, and if the residue be sold, it would produce two hundred millions of dollars; he would be willing to vote all this to ameliorate the condition of the free blacks.

Mr. W. then concluded in some general remarks upon the times, and the necessity for their showing themselves true to their duties—he hoped there would be no pigmies when the case called for men; and in some remarks upon the boundless prosperity of the country and its hopes for the future.

Mr. Calhoun said that he ruse for the purpose of correcting an error of the Senator in supposing that the purchase of Florida and Louisiana, and the annexation of Texas, were to promote the interests of the cotton growers.

The purchase of Florida resulted from the Indian wars, and the continual source of annoyance it would be on that account, if left in foreign hands. Louisiana was purchased in consequence of the refusal of the right of deposit at New Orleans. A member of the old Federal party had recommended a resort to arms, but Mr. Jefferson prudently purchased it. The British government had received overtures from American Abolitionists, and was urging Mexico to recognize the independence of Texas, on the provision of the abolition of Slavery there. If this were done it would leave all the Southern frontier open to encroachments on slave property. For this reason he had advocated its annexation. He always held that re-annexation was unconstitutional and absurd.

The ordinance of 1787 was adopted by the South because it contained a provision about the delivery of fugitive slaves, similar to the one in the Constitution; but, like that had become a dead letter.

He was glad to hear the Senator say he would not vote for the Wilmot proviso; but was willing to leave it to nature. This was all the South wanted He was surprised to hear of the consummate folly, that the Mexican laws abolishing Slavery were in force in the territories.

He was in favor of the Union. His public acts for forty years testified his devotion to the Constitution. He differed with the Senator about the power to break this Union. Would the Senator say that no degree of oppression would justify a dissolution of the Union? The Union could only be preserved by adhering to justice and good faith, and a rigid adherance to the Constitution.

Mr. Webster said he knew the Union could be broken, but not by a peaceable secession. He knew, also, that if oppression was extreme, resistance might be justifiable, but that would be the power of revolution, and not secession. He took occasion to return his thanks to the Senators from Kentucky (Mr. Clay) and from Tennessee, (Mr Bell) for having brought forward their propositions, and for the light they had afforded him. Hereafter he would take an opportunity of speaking on the subject of California and her boundaries.

Mr. Calhoun briefly rejoined.

ON MONDAY, the 11th instant, Mr. Seward obtained the floor and addressed the Senate. Though crowded for room we lay the Telegraphic report of his speech before our readers. Meagre as it evidently is, there is enough of it to show that it will answer the expectation formed of it:

Mr. SEWARD having the floor, addressed the Senate. He commenced by an allusion to the remarkable history of California, which, four years ago, was scarcely inhabited, quite unexplored, and almost unknown, except for its capacious harbor, which statesmen alone foresaw would be useful in a distant, if not chimerical, future. A few years ago she was a mere military dependency of our own, and we were considering with enthusiasm its acquisition with its newly discovered mineral wealth. To-day she is a State more populous than the least and richer than the greatest in the Union, for admission into which she was now applying, while Congress was debating the dissolution of that Union itself.

Should California be received? For himself, upon his individual judgment and responsibility, he said yes. As one of the instructed representatives of one of the States which was to be most rivalled by the new commonwealth, yes. Every State was welcome, come from what quarter she might, but California, with her position—the youthful queen of the Pacific, in the robes of freedom, gorgeously inlaid with gold—was doubly welcome.

Why should she be rejected? Mr. S. proceeded to consider this question, stating that all the objections were founded either in the circumstances of her coming and the organic law which also she presented for confirmation.

First, California has come unceremoniously, without a preliminary consent of Congress, and, therefore, by usurpation. He replied to this objection at length. The Treaty with Mexico gave her a right to come, and there were many precedents answering the latter part of the objection, furnished in the case of Michigan and other States. Her case was even stronger than that of Michigan. Congress refused her a government, and obeying the law of self-preservation, she formed a constitution for herself, and deserved, not rebuke, but praise and approbation.

Mr. S. proceeded to answer *seriatim* the objections made to California because she had defined her own boundaries; because she was too large; because no previous census had been taken, and no laws prescribing the qualifications of suffrage and apportionment of Representatives in Convention. The latter objection might well be waived, if the Constitution was satisfactory to the State herself and to the United States. No complaint had followed the Constitution here, and it was satisfactory to us, or ought to be, as it answered all that has heretofore been a subject of inquiry with us in connection with the Constitution of other new States. Mr. S. further answered the objection that California comes here under Executive influence, first, as a free State, and second, in coming at all.

The first charge rested on suspicion, was peremptorily denied, and the denial was not controverted by proof. The second charge was true, to the extent that both Presidents Polk and Taylor advised the people of California in their helpless condition, that the adoption of a constitution subject to the approval of Congress would be regarded favorably. A year ago the exercise of the military power to preserve order in California was complained of as a fearful innovation; but the wind has changed now and blows even stronger in the opposite direction. He hoped we might never have a President commit a more serious or dangerous assumption of power than the act of the present eminent Chief Magistrate, in endeavoring to induce the Legislative authorities to relieve him from the exercise of military power by establishing civil institutions, regulated by law, in distant provinces. Rome would have been standing this day if she had had such Generals and such Magistrates. But the question was, in any case, immaterial. The question was not what moved California to press a particular feature on her Constitution, nor what induced her to adopt it at all, but whether, having adopted a Constitution, she shall be admitted into the Union.

These were all the objections urged against the admission of California, and it would seem that they had no foundation in the law of nature or of nations. They were all merely formal or technical, resting upon precedents which have not even been generally observed. It was too late to seize the present occasion to establish a precedent for the future. The irregularity complained of being unavoidable, the caution should have been exercised when Texas was admitted, in the War with Mexico, in the Treaty with Mexico. Again, if precedents were made, our successors would exercise their pleasure about following them, just as we have done in such cases. Again, States, Nations and Empires were apt to be peculiarly capricious both as to the time and manner of their being born, and as to their subsequent political changes. California had sprung from the head of a nation, not only complete in proportions and full armed, but ripe for application with its members.

Mr. S. next proceeded to give his reasons for the opinion that California ought to be admitted. He considered the probable increase of population in the United States, and one hundred years in the future, put it down at two hundred millions, which would, ere that time, have extended itself over our whole possessions, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, bringing it into social maturity, and complete public organization. The question was then whether this great people, speaking the same language, having the same origin, a common language and common sentiments, should remain one nation, or be broken into two conflicting and probably hostile nations. In view of our position, our power, and our capabilities among the nations of the world, division was inadvisable, presumptuous, not to be thought of.

The perpetual unity of the empire appeared to him to hang upon the decision of this day and hour. California was already a complete State, and could never again be less than that—never again could be a province or a colony, or shrink into the proportions of a Federal dependent territory. The question whether she shall be one of us depending entirely upon us, and our decision must be made now or never. Nothing prevents her admission now but want of agreement among ourselves, which would not be remedied by delay. Nor would California abide delay. She had many motives for independence, and if she did not contemplate it, it was only because she did not anticipate rejection. If she chose it, we had not the ability to prevent her achieving independence, she had the same moral abilities for enterprise that inured us. She had advantages of position. She was practically further from us than England. We could not reach her by railroad or unbroken steam navigation. Our army and navy would be useless against her.

Nor would California go alone. Oregon so intimately allied to her and so loosely attached to us, would go also, and thus the entire Pacific coast, with the western declivity of the Sierra Nevada, would be lost to us.

It was insisted that the admission of California shall be attended by a compromise of the Slavery question. He was opposed to any such compromise in any and every form, which had been proposed. Legislative compromises were all radically wrong, involving a surrender of the exercise of judgment, and the right to reconsider in future the decisions of the present; the mere usurpations as to future questions, of the province of future legislators. What was he to give up in this compromise? Some portion of human rights, some portion of liberty in one region, for liberty in another region. But California brings gold as well as freedom. He was, then, to surrender some portion of human freedom for the mixed consideration of Liberty, Gold and Power on the Pacific coast.

But he was opposed to this compromise in particular, because of the inequality and incongruity of the interest to be compromised. California must come in whether Slavery stands or falls in the District of Columbia, New Mexico, California, or even in the Slave States; what were the questions; they were unnecessary, incongruous, and therefore false issues, if not introduced to defeat the great policy. Consent on his part to the compromise would be disingenuous and fraudulent.

Mr. S. reviewed the position taken by Mr. Calhoun. The terms upon which the Senator proposed a settlement amounted simply to this: that the Free States, being a majority of States and population, should concede to the slave States, being in a minority in both, the unequal advantage of an equality in the Senate; that is, we were to convert the Government from a National Democracy, controlled by a majority of voices, into a Federal Alliance in which the minority shall have the veto against the majority. But the scheme of equilibrium between the States was impracticable, because of the inequality of territory,—which was already lost,—and a perpetual equality in the number of Slaves and Freemen, which could not be, because of the greater ratio of increase of population in the Free States.

Neither would success attend the details of the Compromise. No law could be made more stringent than those now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves; and no government ever yet succeeded in changing the moral convictions of its subjects by force. The extradition of fugitives from justice was not admitted by the Law of Nature and of Nations, but rested in voluntary compacts. There were but two compacts found in Diplomatic History, *admitting* extradition of slaves—one during the Ancients, and the other in the Constitution of the United States. The Law of Nations disavows such compacts, and the Law of Nature written in the hearts and consciences of freemen repudiates them.

Another feature in most of the plans of Compromise, was a bill of peace for Slavery in the District of Columbia; which bill could not be granted, because the people of the Free States were equally responsible as to the slave States for Slavery in that District, the field exclusively of our common legislation. There was now little reason to hope that a majority existed in the Senate in favor of Emancipation But if the compromise were made, these States would assume the whole responsibility of the stipulation not to exercise the power hereafter when it is acquired.

The proposed compromise of the boundary of Texas was a Judicial question, and should be kept distinct and settled by itself alone. He also objected to the principle on which the compromise rests, because it is a classification of the States as Northern or Southern, or Free or Slave States, leading to the position that the several classes of States, as such, have a right to participation in the Territories, and a consequent right to carry the property respectively recognized by them to the Territories, and the setting apart to Slavery a distinct portion of such Territory. In the course of argument upon this point, Mr. S. denied that the Constitution recognizes property in man. The Constitution not merely does not affirm that principle, but on the contrary, altogether excludes it, and in support of this position he quoted from Jay, Madison and others.

Mr. S. continued at considerable length in a close and interesting argument in relation to this question of the classification of States, and its mischievous tendencies and results, considering incidentally the evils of Slavery as subversive of free institutions, conducive of ignorance and consequent vice, inhuman, expensive, and at war with equality and the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the choice of pursuits of happiness.

But they were told that distress and wretchedness existed even in free States. Do we (said Mr. S.) screen the cause of them, or repudiate your sympathy? Are they existing because of freedom? In answer to some remarks made by Mr. Dawson, some time since, he contended that New York city was not a city of freedom alone, but a city of the Continent, a metropolis of the world, receiving into its bosom whatever is good and whatever is evil from the face of the whole world. He also answered the various Senators who had assumed that crime at the North increased with education—that the slaves of the South were more comfortable and happy than the laborers of the North, and that the former are better fed and clothed than the latter. The error of the Senate making the latter point, arose from considering those as all the laboring population of the free States who, by indolence, intemperance, or accident, do not labor at all. If he would have an answer, let him look at our ships, our wharves, edifices, aqueducts, canals, railroads, manufactures and farms—our hospitals, asylums, colleges and schools, and say whether they who have brought them to their present perfection, and who own and enjoy them all, are paupers and mendicants.

But even if the comparison were just, it was a more conclusive answer that the right would require us to subvert our own free institutions, and establish Despotism; and an equally conclusive reply, that we have no right to enslave a fellow man even for the purpose of promoting his happiness. In taking leave of the honorable Senator, (Mr. Downs) he asked him whether it was ever known that the most wretched freeman sold himself into Slavery, and whether as a general fact, the happiest slave does not burn for freedom with its chances of penury and want. In concluding this part of the subject, Mr. S. said that, whether regarding the welfare of the future inhabitants of the New Territories, the security and welfare of the whole people of the United States, or the welfare of the whole family of mankind, he could not consent to introduce Slavery into any part of the Continent which is now exempt from so great an evil. These were his reasons for declining to compromise the questions relating to Slavery as a condition of the admission of California.

Mr. S. then proceeded to examine the arguments advanced by Senators who differed from him, considering the power of Congress to legislate on the subject of Slavery in the territories, the argument that the inhibition is unnecessary, the assertion that the diffusion of Slavery does not increase its evils, and, lastly, the great and all-absorbing argument, that the Union is in danger of being dissolved, and that it can only be saved by the compromise. Upon this point Mr. S. dwelt at considerable length expressing his confidence in the perpetuity of the Union. He considered in detail the various evidences of excitement, examining their causes and their character, comparing the action of Legislatures in both sections, and the spirit of the masses of the people. He discovered no omens of revolution. One circumstance that discredits this revolution was, that it had been predicted too long and with too much accuracy. It had been calculated like an eclipse. This revolution begins in Congress, and it will end here. It commenced when Butler, Foote, Hunter and Turney procured the issuing of the Southern Address. If this should result in revolution proper, its originators would have the merit of discovering a new and easy method of revolution. Again: revolutions make their own leaders, but this was made by its leaders.

In concluding an able consideration of the numerous reasons given for a disunion, and a presentation of very many and pointed arguments against the possibility of such a consummation, Mr. S. said: Let those, then, who distrust the Union, make compromises to save it. He should not suspect their wisdom or their patriotism; but, having no such apprehensions, he should vote for the admission of California, directly, without conditions and without qualifications or compromise. For the justification of that vote he looked not to the approval of this day or generation, but to that day, happily not far distant that some of us might see it, when the American people should have spread over the inhabitable regions of all the Continent of North America, and Slavery shall have passed away from it, under the influence of these beneficent institutions.

In the course of Mr. SEWARD's closing remarks, Mr. FOOTE interrupted him for the purpose of explaining what he meant by his assertion a few days since, that if the questions of Slavery were not disposed of by a certain day, they would be out of jurisdiction He denied that he had fixed a day for Disunion. He had heard that Northern men in the House were determined to force DOTY's resolution through on a certain day, even by voting the Speaker from his Chair, if necessary, in order to accomplish that end. Such a course would have been oppressive and unjust, and would have justified the South in resisting it by such measures as might present themselves, and which would have been seized if he knew anything of the spirit of his countrymen. It was this that he feared and warred against, and he was glad to know that his warning had its effect in certain quarters—the resolution in question was withdrawn, and thus, thank God, the crisis was averted.

Mr. SEWARD was glad that he had given the Senator an opportunity to make his explanation.

Mr. WEBSTER, at the close of Mr. Seward's speech, read an extract from the resolutions for Texas annexation, to show that Congress was bound to receive four new Slave States out of Texas, if her people chose to form them.

Mr HALE asked Mr. Webster whether he thought it was competent for Congress to enter into any such compact with Texas—Texas then being a foreign power? Was not any such compact void, because no compact could be entered into with a foreign power, except by the Treaty-making power?

Mr. WEBSTER replied that such power was constitutionally exercised under the right to admit new States.

After some further conversation, Mr. DOUGLASS obtained the floor, and the further consideration of the subject was postponed until Monday.

Mr. FOOTE gave notice that he would to-morrow press his motion for a Select Committe of thirteen. Adjourned.

General Intelligence.

FAST-DAY in New Hampshire, Thursday, April 4.

——In Worcester, the free soilers elected their Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council, and all other officers, except the ward officers in the 7th ward.

——AMONGST the emigrants in a late passe nger vessel from Boston to California, are twenty-one ladies, adventurers to the gold regions.

——A REPORT in favor of negro suffrage, was on Thursday ordered to a second reading in the New Jersey Legislature, by a vote of ayes, 33, nays 21.

——THE *Lowell American* very significantly announces that Daniel Webster's senatorial term expires in 1851.

——APPOINTMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT AND SENATE.—Fletcher Webster, Surveyor of the Customs, Boston, Massachusetts, vice John McNeil, deceased.

——MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH.—It cannot be denied that the speech of Mr. Webster has produced much surprise and no little dissatisfaction among his friends here. Even the Atlas admits as much.—*Boston Transcript.*

——NOMINATIONS FOR AUSTRIA.—The President has nominated Hon. Richard W. Thompson of Indiana (member in last House) to be Charge de Affaires to Austria, *vice* Col. James Watson Webb, rejected.

——KENTUCKY AGAINST THE NASHVILLE CONVENTION.—The Senate of Kentucky, on the 27th ultimo, by a vote of 26 to 9, laid on the table resolutions which had been offered for appointing delegates to the Nashville Convention.

——A UNION CONVENTION.—As the Disunionists talk of holding a Convention at Nashville in June next, it has been suggested that the friends of the Union in the South meet in Convention at the same place on the 4th of July next. We are for this most heartily, and for every other scheme for rebuking the mad spirit of treason to the Constitution, which is seeking to alienate the affections of the people from that bond of States that every American citizen should estimate as being above all price. Our motto is: Down with the Factionists—Everything for the Union.—*Knoxville [Tenn.] Register.*

——AWFUL DISASTER.—The steamer St. Johns was burnt to the water's edge near Bridgeport, Dallas county, on her upward trip to Montgomery, at 6 o'clock on Tuesday evening.

It is supposed that about 30 persons were burnt to death and drowned. The fire was accidental, and the ladies on board, numbering 7 or 8, were lost.

Lieut. Rice of the U. S. A. lost some $250,000; several Californians also lost their all.

——GOLD MINE IN WESTFIELD, MASS.—A correspondent of the *Standard* has examined some gold pronounced by one of the jewellers to be of fine quality, dug from some land in that vicinity by Mr. Ezra Hubbard. The ore was in small scales, very similar to that found in California, and Mr. H. states that it is extremely plenty where he obtained it. He has purchased the land.

——REMOVAL OF THE LEGISLATURE.—The General Assembly of Ohio have determined to remove from Columbus to Cincinnati, and the two Houses with their officers and attaches, are to embark bodily in the railway cars for this city to-day, including Speaker Leiter and Judge Whitman, and recently several members of the "Committee of Public Safety."—*Cincinnati Gazette, March 2.*

——SUSPICION OF KIDNAPPING.—Wm. Lambden, master and owner of schhoner Gen. Jackson, of Wilmington, Del. was brought before the Mayor, yesterday on his warrant, under the following circumstances: He sailed from Philadelphia on the 5th ultimo, with a crew consisting of three colored men, named George Thompson, Stephen Anderson, and John Marothey, who had shipped at Philadelphia for the purpose of coming down the Chesapeake for a load of sweet potatoes, or oysters, and to return in three weeks, the men were to have an equal share of the profits The schooner put in here on Tuesday evening, and yesterday morning the Captain offered to sell the colored men to officers Cox and Cherry for the sum of $700, stating that he was only half owner of the negroes, but was authorized to give a full bill of sale. He afterwards stated to one of them that it was a "kidnapping concern," but he could nevertheless secure the purchaser from damage. Upon this information, the Mayor committed Lambden and the three men to jail for further examination.—*Norfolk Herald, March 7.*

——SENATOR DOUGLASS.—A correspondent of the *Tribune*, writing from Chicago says: A mass meeting of the people, without distinction of party, was held last night at the City Hall. The Mayor presided. The resolutions adopted were strongly opposed to any compromise, and the people of the Free States were invoked to a similar expression, lest the silence of the party press should be construed into acquiescence or indifference to the extension of Slavery on the part of the Free States. Senator Douglass' proposition for a Compromise was denounced, and he was called upon to obey instructions or resign.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.—The *Boston Traveller* copies from the *Atlas* the complete returns from the several towns which show the following result:—

4th March, 1850.		
Palfrey	Robinson	Thompson
4318	2266	4624
21st January, 1850.		
Palfrey	Robinson	Thompson
3927	1902	4528

And then adds:

"This result shows an increase of 851 votes over the number given at the trial in January. This increase is divided among the candidates as follows: Palfrey, 391, Robinson 364, and Thompson 96. Mr. Thompson now leads Mr. Palfrey 306 votes; at the last trial he led him 601—Thompson's loss in that respect, 305. The majority against Mr. Thompson at the lost trial was 1301; now it is, including the 70 scattered votes, 2030—making his nett loss 729."

——NEW YORK STATE PEACE CONVENTION.—This Convention, called for the purpose of appointing two delegates at large to represent the State at the Frankfort Congress, and also to devise and adopt measures for the securing of representatives in the same assembly from the different Congressional Districts, towns, &c. in this State, convened yesterday morning in the session room of the North Pearl-st. Baptist Church. William Williams of New York, was chosen President, Martin J. Townsend, Vice President, and H. L. Dox of Rensselaer, Co, Secretary.

After the election of officers, Elihu Burritt addressed the Convention. He spoke of the objects of the Convention, and of the success which had crowned his efforts in England and France. At the conclusion of his remarks, the Convention took a recess until three o'clock.

In the evening, several interesting speeches were made to a full house, when the Convention adjourned.—*Albany Evening Journal.*

——THE NORTH VS. THE SOUTH.—A general fight took place in Purchase, between Atkinson and Pearl sts. yesterday, after school hours. The combatants were boys—who reside at the North and South parts of the city—and the difficulty between them arose out of some dispute concerning the superiority of the inhabitants of those localities. Many efforts had been made to "compromise," but to no purpose. The Southerners would concede nothing—they must fight—"war was inevitable." The lads of the North End after much deliberation, finally took up the challenge, met their adversaries at the point designated, and fought them bravely. The contest, while it lasted, was very fierce, and one Southern chap was awfully whipped. He was the Senator Foote of his party, and he received a bloody nose, a black eye, and his pantaloons were badly torn. The presence of some policemen cut short the contest; but as far as it went, the South suffered the most.—*Boston Courier.*

——STATISTICS OF THE JEWS.—An official publication informs us that there are hardly more than from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 Jews in the whole world; whereas Buddhism numbers 400,000,000 adepts; Brahmism 200,000,000; Christianity, 230,000 000 to 250,000,000; Mahometanism, from 130,000,000 to 150,000,000; and Fetishism (or pure idolatry,) from 80,000.000 to 100,000,000 The 5,000,000 Jews are thus distributed: There are some 500,000 in Syria and Asiatic Turkey; 250,000 in European Turkey; 600,000 in Morocco and North Africa; 50,000 to 80 000 in Eastern Asia; 100 000 in America; and about 200,000 in Europe—viz: 13,000 in England; 1,594 in Belgium; 850 in Sweden and Norway; 6 000 in Denmark; 70,000 in France, 32,000 in the Lower Countries; 1,120,000 in Russia (more than one-fifth of the entire race); 631,000 in Austria and its dependencies; 214 431 in Prussia; 175,000 in the German States; and 4,000 in Italy.

——AFRICAN COLONIZATION.—We understand that the Louisiana State Colonization Society are about sending an expedition to the Liberian Republic, on

Poetry.

From the London Examiner.

TO THE AUTHOR OF FESTUS.

On the Classic and Romantic.

PHILIP! I know thee not, thy song I know;
It fell upon my ear among the last
Destined to fall upon it: but while strength
Is left me, I will rise to hail the morn
Of the stout-hearted who begin a work
Wherein I did but idle at odd hours.
The Faeries never tempted me away
From higher fountains and severer shades;
Their rings allured me not from deeper tracks
Left by Olympic wheels on ampler plains,
Yet I could see them and can see them now
With pleasurable warmth, and hold in bonds
Of brotherhood men whom their gamesome wreath
In youth's fresh slumbers caught, and still detains.
I wear no cestus: my right hand is free
To point the road few seem inclined to take.
Admonish thou, with me, the starting youth,
Ready to sieze all nature at one grasp,
To mingle earth, sea, sky, woods, cataracts,
And make all nations think and speak alike.
Some see but sunshine, others see but gloom,
Others confound them strangely, furiously:
Most have an eye for color, few for form.
Imperfect is the glory to *create*,
Unless on our creation we can look
And see that all is good; we then may rest.
In every poem train the leading shoot;
Break off the suckers Thought erases thought,
As numerous sheep erase each other's print
When spungy moss they press or sterile sand.
Blades thickly sown want nutriment and droop,
Although the seed be sound, and rich the soil.
Thus healthy-born ideas, bedded close
By dreaming fondness, perish overlaid.
We talk of schools.....unscholarly; of schools.
Part the romantic from the classical.
The classical like the heroic age
Is past; but Poetry may reassume
That glorious name with Tartar and with Turk,
With Goth or Arab, Sheik or Paladin,
And not with Roman and with Greek alone.
The name is graven on the workmanship.
The trumpet-blast of *Marmion* never shook
The walls of God-built Ilion; yet what shout
Of the Achaians swells the heart so high?
Shakspeare with majesty benign called up
The obedient classics from their marble seats,
And led them through dim glens and sheeny glades,
And over precipices, over seas
Unknown by mariners, to palaces
High-archt, to festival, to dance, to joust,
And gave them golden spurs and vizors barred,
And steeds that Phidas had turned pale to see.
That mighty man who opened paradise,
Harmonious far above Homeric song,
Or any song that human ears shall hear,
Sometimes was classical and sometimes not.
Rome chained him down, the younger Italy
Dissolved, not fatally, his Sampson strength.
I leave behind me those who stood around
The throne of Shakspeare, sturdy, but unclean;
To hurry past the opprobious courts and lanes
Of the loose pipers at the Belial feasts,
Past mimes obscene, and grinders of lampoons.....
Away the petty wheel, the callous hand!
Goldsmith was classical, and Gray almost.
Cowper had more variety, more strength,
Gentlest of bards! still pitied, still beloved!
Romantic, classical, the female hand
That chained the cruel Ivan down forever,
And followed up, wrapt in his fiery car,
The boy of Casabianca to the skies.
Wordsworth, in sonnet, is a classic too,
And on the grass-plot sits at Milton's side;
In the long walk he is soon out of breath
And wheezes heavier than his friends could wish.
Follow the pedlar up the devious rill,
And if you faint not, you are well repaid.
Large lumps of precious metal lie engulpht
In gravelly beds, whence you must delve them out,
And thirst sometimes and hunger; shudder not
To wield the pickaxe and to shake the sieve.
Too weak for ode or epic, and his gait
Somewhat too rural for the tragic pall,
Which never was cut out of duffel grey,
He fell, entangled, "on the grunsel-edge"
Flat on his face "and shamed his worshippers."
Classic in every feature was my friend
The genial Southey: none who ruled around
Held in such order such a wide domain....
But often too indulgent, too profuse.
The ancients see us under them and grieve
That we are parted by a rank morass,
Wishing its flowers more delicate and fewer.
Abstemious were the Greeks; they never strove
To look so fierce; their muses were sedate,
Never obstreperous; you heard no breath
Outside the flute; each sound ran clear within.
The Fauns might dance, might clap their hands, might shout,
Might revel and run riotous; the Nymphs
Furtively glanced, and feared, or seemed to fear:
Descended on the lightest of light wings,
The strong though graceful Hermes mused awhile,
And now with his own lyre and now with voice
Tempered the strain; Apollo calmly smiled.

WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR.

BREVITY OF LIFE

BY FRANCIS QUARLES.

Behold
How short a span
Was long enough of old,
To measure out the life of man!
In those well-tempered days, his time was then
Surveyed, cast up, and found but three-score years and ten.

Alas!
And what is that?
They come, and slide, and pass,
Before my pen can tell thee what,
The posts of time are swift, which having run,
Their seven short stages o'er, their short-lived task is done.

Our days
Begun, we lend
To sleep, to antic plays
And toys, until the first stage end:
Twelve waning moons, twice five times told,
we give
To unrecovered loss--we rather breathe than live.

We spend
A ten year's breath
Before we apprehend
What 'tis to live, or fear a death!
Our childish dreams are filled with painted joys,
Which please our sense awhile, and waning prove but toys.

How vain
How wretched, is
Poor man, that doth remain
A slave to such a state as this!
His days are short, at longest; few, at most;
They are but bad, at best; yet lavished out and lost.

They be
The secret springs
That make our minutes flee
On wheels more swift than eagles' wings:
Our life's a clock, and every gasp of breath
Breathes forth a warning grief, till time shall strike a death.

How soon
Our new-born light
Attains to full-aged noon!
And this, how soon to gray-haired night!
We spring, we bud, we blossom, and we blast,
Ere we can count our days, our days they flee so fast.

They end
When scarce begun;
And ere we apprehend
That we begin to live, our life is done.
Man, count thy days; and if they fly too fast
For thy dull thought to count, count every day thy last.

Miscellany.

LITERARY WOMEN.

BY MRS. C. M. KIRKLAND.

LET it not be for a moment supposed that we are about to attempt a crusade in defence of blue-stockings! Better undertake, single-handed, to lay a T rail to the Pacific, tunnelling the Rocky Mountains. Whether the prejudice entertained against this class—is it numerous enough to claim the title of a class?—be just or not, it is most potent; and, like the deat adder, it stoppeth its ears. We hardly know of one more obstinate, unless it be that against old maids,—or that other, perhaps worse one, against step-mothers.

Now prejudices are very respectable things.—They have antiquity and ancestry in their favor. They enjoy unflinching allegiance from many very dignified and important people. They partake of the nature of faith, the most consolatory and consonant of all the tendencies of the human mind.—They save the trouble of argument and reflection, and all the discomfort of doubt. Who then will rashly quarrel with prejudices?

To be sure they may be occasionally the cause of injustice; even the epithet cruel, has been from time to time applied to them by precise and over-conscientious people. They often sweep into one category instances the most obviously incongruous, forcing into a single class individuals of all sizes, till the array is like that of the army in Bombastes Furioso, which consists of "three-foot drummer, six-foot fifer, two very odd privates, and the general." Prejudice never wastes time in sifting or weighing, measuring or comparing. It glories at once in the promptitude and irrevocableness of its decisions. It is fond of whirling a sword horizontally, and feels quite clear of any guilt when heads are sliced off. The only thing that makes it at all nervous, is the head's venturing to talk afterwards. This is *lese majeste*—"most intolerable and not to be borne."

Therefore, we shall not attempt it,—least of all when literally women are in question. It is many a long year, many a dusty century, since this would have been safe. In the days of Miriam or Deborah, perhaps—but that was in the world's callow time, before lordship had become so much an object of desire among the stronger part of creation, and before education had been brought to offer its all-potent arm in aid of this design. Now-a-days, to be betrayed into the quixotism of defending blue-stockings, is to allow one's self to be suspected of wearing them. The utmost extent to which our courage will carry us in some little examination, after the natural-history fashion; some search into growth and properties, alms, destiny, and uses or no-uses. And to keep very clear of all ungenerous imputations of sympathy, we shall take care to deal with the subject after the desultory, unsystematic, and feminine manner. We repudiate learning; we disclaim accuracy; we adjure logic. We shall aim only at the pretty prattle which is conceded to our sex as a right, and admired as a charm.

How many literary women has any one person ever seen? How many has the world seen? How would the list compare in length with that of the pretty triflers who never in the whole course of their mortal life took up a book with the least intention of obtaining any information from it? The spite which is generally nourished against these unhappy ladies implies great respect; for their numbers are too insignificant to attract notice, if the individuals were not of consequence. And it may be noticed here, as being particularly curious, that the man who disclaims loudest against the ideal of a writing woman, is sure to be vain-glorious of the smallest literary performance on the part of his wife or daughter. The gift of a place does not sooner silence a vehement patriot, than the first essay or magazine story produced by a lady of his family, does the indigent definer of "woman's sphere," with a pudding and a shirt for its two poles.

But as to the comparative scarcity of literary ladies. It seems strange to a simple looker-on that they should not be prized, at least on the principle of the Queen Anne's farthing, which, valueless in itself, became precious because there were but four struck. There is not even yet a "mob of gentle [*women*] that write with ease." Women are said to be peculiarly favored in the possesion of the quality called "passive courage," (fortitude?) one of the benevolent provisions of nature for need—but they have always, as a body, shown a good deal of cowardice in this matter. The risks are too fearful. So that really the number is kept down as low as prudence can desire. It would require no Briareus to count on his fingers all that have dabbled in ink during the last century. No fear of usurpation; no danger that the pen will be snatched from strong hands and wielded in defiance. A handful of chimney swallows might as well be suspected of erecting their quills against the eagles—or owls. Swallows! literary ladies are hardly more abundant than dodos.

Now let us ask what is the distinguishing mark of the literary woman of our day. Is it inky fingers—corrugated brows--unkept locks--unrighteous stockings—towering talk—disdain of dinner—aspirations after garments symbolical of authority—any or all of these? Who pretends anything of the kind? One could almost wish there were some startling peculiarities, even though exhibited by only a few individuals, to break up the uniformity of society. What a treat it would be to see a blue enter a party with the suitable airs, and cross the awful space of carpet which sometimes intervenes between the door and the hostess, with gown pinned up from the mud, or one black slipper and one white one, the unconscious head all the while nodding graciously on either side, secure of the due effect of the *entree*. But alas! no literary lady, since Mrs. Ann Royall, has borne about with her the least outward token of the dreaded power within. Curls, ribbons, bracelets, bouquets, fans,—not an item lacking; all correct, to the very shoe-tie. Here surely is a title to respect—a claim to the feminine character, though a loss to society. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu did better when she received her English visiters at Venice in a mask and domino, as a reproof to their curosity.

And as in dress, so in other matters. Whether from the increased facilities of life, or because the world has grown older, and so more cunning and commonplace, there is no telling a bookish woman any more, even in her housekeeping. There are no more cobwebs in literary parlors than elsewhere. The presence of "books that are books" does not necessarily now imply the absence of books which are principally covers and "illustrations." All sorts of unmanageable and worse than useless bindings may be found intermixed with plain, serviceable duodecimos, and the blue, and yellow, and gray paper of the Reviews and Magazines Even an inkstand does not take the place of nicknacks and pretty lumber, though these generally drive the more suspicious article into a by-corner.

"There is a general notion," says Sydney Smith, "that if you once suffer woman to eat of the tree of knowledge, the rest of the family will soon be reduced to the same aërial and unsatisfactory diet." But the children of literary mammas seem to be nearly as well cared for, as if their mothers did not, or could not read—which is probably in some minds the criterion of a thoroughly admirable wife and mother. They are even found in some cases to entertain the profoundest and most tender affection for her whom society agrees to consider a deluded female. This would seem as if a love of books did not quite extinguish the affections, or the qualities which inspire affections "Would a mother desert her infant for a quadratic equation?" says the satirist just quoted. And it remains to be proved that there is greater complaint of missing buttons, or more neglect of the "stitch in time," in consequence of some use of the pen as well as the thimble, than in the houses where the only amusements is dressing, and the only serious employments scolding the servants.

With regard to domestic government, the point on which the sensitive wisdom of the world is most alarmed—fearing lest the staff of authority should be wrested from the grasp of the legal ruler, by heads that were long ago decided to be too weak to wield it even it peaceably accorded—does it not seem as if in the want of interest in home affairs, which is charged as a natural fault in the literary lady should set at rest any dread of her usurping too large a share of direction in home arrangements? Is it the absent-minded, absorbed, wool-gathering, star-gazing dame that will quarrel to have the bacon fried instead of boiled? Will she recall the eyes ever "in fine frenzy rolling" to the dull earth long enough or with interest enough to insist upon new carpets? It seems as if one fear or the other must be unfounded. Either literary women care about domestic matters or they do not If they do, their employments cannot be objected against as interfering with exclusively feminine duties; if not, surely their husbands need not fear improper interference.

But we have hitherto neglected to inquire what it is that entitles a woman to the appellation of literary; or perhaps we should express the matter better, if we should say, what fastens upon her that imputation. Must she have written a book?—Phœbus Apollo! how few then have claims upon a *labouret* at thy cont! And must the size of the book be taken into account? Then those who dilate unscrupulously will sit highest. Or will the number of volumes settle precedence? There will, in that case, be little room for any but Mrs. Ellis, Mrs. Gore, and their immediate sisterhood. But to the point. If not a book, will a poem be sufficient? or an essay? or a magazine article? Then more of us are included in the glory or odium of female authorship. Or does writing letters make one literary? In these California days it is to be hoped not, lest some of our fair friends should be tempted to neglect their absent brothers rather than be liable to misconstruction, in so important a particular. Writing letters sometimes ends in writing books, as more than Madame de Sevigné can testify. How is it with keeping a journal? Does that come within the canon? Might it not be maliciously interpreted to be writing a book in disguise?

Does the toleration for which a female writer may hope depend in any degree upon the class of subjects which may engage her pen? We have an idea that some gentlemen would award a palm (no pun, positively,) to her who writes a Cook's Oracle, where a rod or a fool's cap would be the doom of a lady who should presume to touch political economy. Next to a family receipt book, one would suppose books of instruction for children would be most popular in female hands; but there is no doubt that some men think Mrs. Barbauld wore, or should have worn a beard, and would be surprised to see a picture of Mrs. Trimmer in petticoats. The novel of fashionable life, provided it have no suspicion of a moral, and make no pretension to teach anything whatever, may pass as feminine, without detracting from the fame of its author; but a novel with the least bit of bone in it is "manish"—a very different term from "manly." Poetry, provided it be of the sigh-away, die-away cast, does not injure a lady's reputation; acrostic-making is considered quite an accomplishment, and so are watch-paper verses; but poetry which some unthinking, out-of-the-world critics praise as "masculine" for vigor and freshness, is insufferable. If we could show to some objectors the delicate Elizabeth Barrett Browning—the minutest, most fragile, most ethereal creature the sun ever shone upon, with a voice like a ring-dove's, we might swear in vain to her identity as the author of some of the strongest and bravest poetry that has appeared in our day; so obstinate a conviction exists in some minds of the close connexion between mental power and masculine coarseness.

It seems a little inconsistent that ever anybody should venture in our day to put such dangerous weapons as the *ologies* into the hands of a sex to whose peculiar charms too much mind is known to be so fatal. Why not leave a girl in the hands of the nurse until she is fit to be transferred to those of the seamstress, the pastry-cook, the dancing-master, the teacher of music, in succession? Why occupy precious hours and risk fine eyes over even French and Italian, which could be learned in colloquy with these artists? Why not adapt means to ends? Is it certain that school-knowledge will pass in at one ear and out of the other? If not, how far safer not to impart it! Considering the advantage that may be taken of it, the unsexing and unsphering that may ensue upon an indiscreet use of it, surely it were best to send Grammar and History, Philosophy and Mathematics, to the limbo of forgotten things, as far as females are concerned. If Madame de Staël had been brought up only to sing and dance, regulate household affairs, and tend children, would she have written the books which provoked Napoleon to banish her from Paris? If Mrs. Somerville had spent years sitting with her feet in the stocks and her arms pinioned in a back-board to make her genteel, while her eyes were employed in counting headwork, or devising stitches in crochet, could she ever have lowered herself by writing about the geography of the heavens? Prevention is certainly better than cure. Choke the fountain rather than have to dam the river (no pun will be supposed here). Shut up your schools for young ladies; bid the teachers "go spin!" Use the copy-books for recipes or papillottes; the learned treatises popularized "for the use of schools" to kindle fires less to be dreaded than those of literary ambition; and if our daughters should not thereafter be "like polished stones at the corners of the temple," they will at least make kitchen-hearths, which we all know to be a far more obviously useful part of the social edifice.

One great duty of woman, if not the greatest, is to be agreeable. Now, if teaching her to think for herself, and so putting her upon the tempation of expressing her thoughts, imperil in the least degree this her high vocation, we vote for the instant abandonment of female cultivation, and would advocate a heavier fine on selling to a female under forty, unaccompanied by parent or guardian, a card of Joseph Gillott's pens, than for allowing a paper of poison to go from the shop unlabelled. We would be the very Jack Cade of legislators for such offenders.—To be sure there may be question as to the universality of the feeling on which our zeal is predicated. Some men openly profess to like intelligent women, and there are doubtless others who in secret do not altogether reprobate the use of the pen in female hands, although they may for harmony's sake refrain from the avowal of such liberality, except, as we have hinted, the case fall within the limits of their own family circle, when they usually go beyond mere toleration. It is very desirable that unanimity be obtained in this matter. The natural desire to be agreeable will be quite strong enough to set things right after they are fully understood. To stand well with all men will far outweigh the penurious and timid praise of a few. So true is this that Madame de Staël herself confessed that she would gladly give her intellect and her fame for beauty!

But is beauty always the alternative? Ah, there is an important question. Many scandals have been uttered against the outward charms of literary ladies. "Ugly!" said a celebrated poet in our own hearing, on this very topic; "ugly, yes—they *all* are!" Which must mean that lines of thought are disadvantageous to the peculiar charm of the female face; an equivocal compliment, rather. But waiving this delicate point; is the face, which has no lines of thought, on that account beautiful? If not, how fearful the risk of leaving the head unfurnished? If the face may be vacant yet not loved; if we may neglect the brain without securing the beauty; how difficult becomes the decision of the parent. In old times; happy times! when fairies attended at the birth of daughters, and offered choice of gifts, the balance between beauty and good sense was easily struck It was understood that to select the one, precluded all chance of obtaining the other, without a new and more compulsive spell. Now, without any great insight into futurity, and with only a little fat beginning of a face, with a button nose and twinkling eyes to guide our estimate of probabilities of comeliness, while on the other hand frowns the fear lest furnishing the brain may, by giving a superabundance of meaning to the face, mar the promise of beauty, how anxious must be the deliberation. A critical survey of society might lead one to suppose that with some parents a decision proves impossible, the poor child being left to grow up without either beauty or brains!

Our own convictions on this subject were rendered unalterable some years since in the course of a lecture by a young gentlemen, before a debating society, at whose sitting we were so happy as to assist. The question was one not unfrequently discussed on those occasions—the comparative education of the sexes. Our friend was warm against sharing the sciences with women. His picture of the ideal blue-stocking, a hideous man-woman, with high-crowned cap, and spectacles, hoarse voice and masculine stride, still haunts our imagination, and has ever proved an affectual scare-crow in that field.—On the other hand, his fancy's sketch of a charming young person was such as to leave in one's mind a somewhat confused mass of roses, lilies, smiles, blushes, pearls, snow, raven's wings, and Aurora's fingers, very facinating, though suggestive of despair to most of the sex. But what made the most distinct impression on our memory was the question, repeated in various forms as different branches of knowledge were examined with reference to their fitness for female use—"Will it render her more *alluring?*" Here lay the key; far more potent than Blue Beard's, which locked up only women literally headless—to the whole popular philosophy of female claims on the score of intellect. This hint as to the object of woman's being, solved a world of doubts. Here was a touchstone by which to try any pursuit; a test to determine the value of any talent. Whatever does not conduce to the grand aim must be, if not obnoxious, at best indifferent. Whoever contends that an education regulated by this principle would leave woman insignificant and unhappy, shows only his ignorance of the world; for do we not see every day splendid people who avow it, consciously or unconsciously? and can splendid people be unhappy or insignificant?

There is one potent argument against allowing women in habits of literary employment; the injury that would arise to the great cause of public amusements. Our theatres would be worse filled even than they are at present, and the opera would cease its languishing existence at once, if the fair eyes that now fain to let down the "fringed curtains" as a veil against the intensity of floods of gas-light, should learn to prefer the shaded study-lamp at home, and the singing of the quiet fire to the louder efforts of the cantatrice. Dancing, except in horrible sobriety, after the piano, would become obsolete, waltzing might be studied in the abstract, or as an illustration of the revolution of the heavenly bodies, but "certain stars" would no longer "shoot madly from their spheres" to join the giddy round in person. Parties would break up at eleven; for eyes and nerves would so rise in value if put to serious use, that any wilful expenditure of their powers would soon be voted *mauvais ton*, and if that should ever happen, adieu to suppers and champaigne! There is really no end to the overturn that might result from an innovation of this sort. Imagination pictures the spler did fabric of Fashion tottering to its fall—undermined by that seemingly impotent instrument, the pen, wielded by female hands. We shrink from our own picture of so mournful a reversal of the present happy state of things. It is one of the perversities of the imagination to torment itself with delineations of what can never by any possibility occur, and this is truly a case in point.

The truth being conceded that no women but those who are ugly or unattractive should do or write, a thought suggests itself with respect to the limited duration of the beauty which is so justly considered the most desirable of female possessions, and the most desirable and proper bar to any extensive cultivation of the mind. As none but very robust beauty lasts beyond fifty, would it not be advisable to establish schools, specially fitted for that age, in which the remains of a lovely woman might have an opportunity of some education suited to the twenty years which may be supposed still to lie before her? It would be irksome to pass so long a period in silence, and mortifying to continue to talk nonsense without rosy lips to set it off. Here a certain amount of knowledge might be communicated by those whom inexorable plainness of person had condemned to exercise in early life; and the circumstances might prove mutually beneficial, since the husbands of the once beautiful would undoubtedly be willing to pay liberally for having some ideas infused into their minds, as provision for the conversation of old age. The face could no longer be injured, while the head, and perhaps the heart, too, might gain materially.

Teeth for the toothless, ringlets for the bald,
And roses for the cheeks of faded age—

would be valueless, compared with this more potent elixir of life. The practice of the old surgeons, who sometimes filled the shrunken veins of decrepitude with the rich blood of bounding youth, might be considered a precedent for such efforts as we propose. Scruples were sometimes entertained as to the lawfulness of that mode of repairing the decay of Nature; but to the attempt to make education the substitute for beauty, we are sure, society will not object, even though the result should be that "dim horror"—a literary woman.—*Sartain's Magazine.*

WHITTINGTON CLUB:

LONDON COLLEGE FOR LADIES.

WE copy from one of Mrs. Follen's pleasant letters to the *Child's Friend* the following account of two of the 'institutions' of London.

—You are much impressed,—at least, I was, as I went about London,—with the quiet, substantial, grave and comfortable look of every thing saving the poor beggars, and they are kept in order by the efficient police. They beg with their eyes, and their suffering aspect rather than with their words. But I must tell you about the Ladies' College, or rather Colleges, for there are now two of these institutions in London. One was established two or three years ago, and the other, within the last year. Nothing of the kind has ever pleased me more than these institutions. I had the great pleasure of being present at one of the first lectures there, given by Mr. Scott, and most admirable it was.

A college for ladies! and some folks will be ready to smile at the thought. I will tell you its object, and how it is managed, and you may perhaps be reconciled to it, in spite of its name. It was thought that if girls, when they had finished their school education where they had got through the elements of knowledge, could be able to continue their studies, and go on with them as far as they were disposed to do, it would be a good thing. In order to do this well, and really make progress in the different branches of knowledge, at a tolerably reasonable cost, and yet have the best instructors, it was thought that a place where everything desirable should be taught by the most competent men, and where, by having many pupils, the expense could be made less by far than by private instruction, would be most desirable. So a proper college was established; all the higher brances taught by able, competent men, and the expense reasonable. This succeeded perfectly; the parents and daughters found that it was just what they wanted, and there are now over three hundred pupils in this college. It was thought by benevolent ladies, who saw the good effect of this college, that another establishment of the same kind was called for, in another part of London, and one lady in especial aided the project in a most effectual manner, by lending the money requisite for its commencement. A large house was hired, the rooms properly furnished for lectures, &c., a matron was appointed to see things kept in order, and the first men were engaged for teachers. The young ladies come at the hour appointed for whatever lecture they wish to attend; all, or a part only of the lectures. There is to be a library; there is a reading room, a place for gymnastic exercises, and, in short, every accomodation for them during the time they may wish to stay. If any one attends all the lectures, she may wish to be there all the day, that is during all the hours of study; or a lady can come to one lecture and return to her home. One of the lady visitors to the College is always present at the lectures, so that the strictest order and propriety are preserved. The expense is a guinea and a half per term for a class that meets twice in a week, and a guinea for a class that meets once. For nine guineas a term, a pupil may select from any of the classes to the extent of eighteen lessons in a week. Bible history, ancient and modern, mathematics, the natural sciences, the English language and literature, the German, French, and Italian languages and literature, Latin elocution, vocal music, harmony, drawing, astronomy, with scientific geography, and these studies taught by some of the first men in the kingdom, such as Mr. Newman, Mr. Scott, Mr. Michaly, Dr. Carpenter, all professors in University College, London, with bout thirty pupils; but when I last heard from it, there were upwards of seventy who had joined it.

When I think of what a good thing this must be for a girl who has come from school with a real love of study, and just beginning to know how to study, desiring more knowledge, and usually not able to obtain it on account of the impossibility of obtaining it, you will comprehend what a valuable institution this is, and how much folly and vanity may be prevented in the world by giving to a girl such an opportunity as this affords of making something of herself, and filling her mind with knowledge, which is apt to be followed by "conscious peace and virtue pure." There will be wiser mothers, happier and better wives, when women have a more thorough education. Here in aristocractic England is an institution for educating her women, superior to anything in our country. And no objection of any sort can be made to it by the most fastidious. I conversed with a number of young ladies who were pupils in one or other of these colleges, and it was delightful to hear them speak of their enjoyment of their studies, of the great privilege they considered it, to be able, in this agreeable way, to continue studies they had commenced at school, and acquire a thorough knowledge of what they had only learned superficially.—How I wish we had such an institution in Boston.

It is thought that the College will ere long support itself, that is to say, that the fees of the pupils will pay the lecturers and the expenses of the house; in the mean time, the liberality of one lady enables them to proceed. As the other college, called Queen's College, has done so well, there seems nothing to fear.

There is another institution in London which interested me very much, and that is the Whittington Club. This is a club established for the purpose of giving intellectual and innocent pleasure to the working classes. A large, handsome building is devoted to it, containing rooms enough for their purpose. There is a reading room, a room for conversation and coffee and tea, a room for lectures, a room for music, and one for dancing- A very moderate subscription, I think, five guineas a season, entitles any one to a membership, and to all the pleasures and advantages of the house. Men and women are upon the same footing. You may see a young woman in the reading-room, sitting at the table, reading with no other protector than the good manners and character of the club, or conversing with those in the room devoted to conversation, or taking her part in the concerts they often have, or making herself merry and really recreating herself by a dance, or listening to a lecture from Dr. Nichol on astronomy, or some other learned man upon something else. The most perfect propriety and good manners are preserved; any violation of either is punished by exclusion. I saw and talked a good deal with a young gentlemen who was one of the managers of the club, and whose heart was much in it, and whose place in society was such as to give a peculiar value to his presence at such a club. For, remember, this was a club for trades-people, to enable the young girl who had been making bonnets or dresses all day, and the shopkeeper whose soul is in danger of being ruined by the dulness of his life, to find relieved and enlivening pleasures, such as the more favored classes have always within their reach, and all this at a small expense. This young man, who might adorn any circle, goes to this club himself, is one of them, and his heart is in it. May Heaven bless his efforts. As there have been regulations agreed upon by the shopkeepers to shut their shops at eight o'clock in the evening, in order to enable them and their apprentices to have time for amusement or study in the evening, a club of this sort is still more important and useful.

In these two institutions, one for the thorough education of woman, and the other for the purpose of giving more refined pleasures to the working classes, and awakening in them a sense of the beauty of life, I saw a great progress in justice and humanity. These are two great objects that we can never think too much of. Well educated women and happy laborers would make a new and glorious world for mankind to dwell in. I know it will be said "Think how few can avail themselves of a Ladies' College, or of the Whittington Club." True; but every well informed woman, is a missionary sent out into the world, and it will, most probably, be his or her purpose to extend the blessing of knowlege and innocent happiness to others. These will be like normal schools to prepare others to be teachers of wisdom and humanity. Perhaps I may be too enthusiastic upon these great interests, but I confess I have them much at heart. I would have women demand a higher and more complete education; I would have the laboring classes more happy and more enlightened. We have done much for our country, but not enough. Let our mother country provoke us to good works. I have not yet, I believe, told you how much I enjoyed the feeling, that, though I was in a foreign land, where most things were so different, yet I still heard my own dear mother tongue; of course this was almost laughable, and yet I felt it; there was not the barrier of a foreign language between their hearts and mine. It did seem to me like a mother land. And all were so kind to us!—I shall always bless Old England, if it were only for the Ladies' College, the Whittington Club, and our dear, kind friends who made us so happy there. E. L. F.

CHILDHOOD'S THOUGHTS;

OR, THE PRIMROSES.

"OF all the flowers that stud the meads like stars, or scatter sweet perfume upon the air, there is not one that children love better than the pale yellow Primrose.

"The Cuckoo, who, is very fond of questioning the flowers, one evening asked the Primrose why her stalk was so soft and supple that the wind could blow her about just wherever he chose.

"'Do you not know,' said the Primrose, 'that my stalk is made thus fragile and pliant in order that the tender hands of little children may without hurt or stain gather me to themselves?'

"'Ah! indeed,' replied the Cuckoo, 'I was not aware of that. I have been absent from these banks ever since August, last year,—so that I have almost forgotten the nature of you way-side creatures that grow up beneath the Spring sun. Since such is the case, and you really wished to be culled, I am sorry I called away those children down yonder by the brook. The moment I cried "Cuckoo!" on the opposite bank, away they started: and as they were off before they found out your hiding-place, I suppose they will not care to return by the bank.'

"'Oh, yes, they will,' said the gentle Flower, 'for their home lies this way. But I know not that I must rest content upon my stalk for a few hours longer, until the next rise of sun. It is late, and they will be too tired to gather me to-day. If you will listen patiently for awhile, and call no strange foot hither to disturb us, I will tell you the history of every Primrose that blows. Know, then, O welcome Bird of the opening year! that we are *Childhood's Thoughts*. You may perhaps have noticed that children cannot grasp many of us at one time, by reason that their hands are so small. Yet, how sharp is their sight to discern us,—how quick are their movements to reach the hedge-row where we nestle,—and then, how readily they seize us! In their happy wanderings here among the woodlands, every new thought is a new pleasure. They grasp us one by one, till they can retain no more. Those children whom you saw just now will return presently. Then, mark them well. It will be near their sleeping hour; and with weary limbs they will come homeward, waking soft echoes all round with the music of their pattering feet.

"'And see,—here they come already!' added the Primrose. 'My sister-flowers are still in their little hands:—but how feebly they grasp them! And now, see,—from their small fingers the flower-stars drop one by one, and lie pale upon the sward where their footsteps have passed, fading from them as their young eyes half close at the touch of the coming Sleep!—Fly onward, kind Cuckoo! and encourage their flagging feet homeward with your cheering note, lest they should slumber by the way.'

"The Bird obeyed the gentle Flower; and soon you might hear him calling 'Cuckoo! cuckoo! till his slender throat was hoarse.

"As soon as the early sun was up and away upon his journey towards the west, two children, a brother and a sister, sought, hand in hand, the Primrose bank. They were young and tender creatures,—and their names were Tiny and Wee-thing: Tiny was the brother, and Wee-thing was the sister.

"At the moment that Tiny turned his eager eyes towards the tufts of Primroses, a flower-thought was just in the act of springing up.

"'Oh! sister Wee-thing,' he cried, as he cropped it from its stem, 'I know what I will do. I will pluck a great, great many of these Primrose buds, and I will make you a crown for May-day when it comes.'

"Tiny's thought was but a half-formed thought; not a full-blown flower, but only an opening bud. His sister Wee-thing grasped by its stem a well-formed and perfect flower, and at once replied to him thus:—'Dear brother Tiny, you are very kind; but the buds that bloom to-day will fade long before May-day. Let us, instead, bear them home to our Mother, who is so sick; and let us sit side by side at her bed-foot, and make a flower-chain which shall link us all together.'

"'Oh! yes, yes, yes! that will do!' exclaimed Tiny, in answer, as he capered about and clapped his little hands with delight.

"When the two children had collected enough, they once more linked hands, and went straight home: not loitering by the way, as children sometimes do,—but, content with what they had gathered, they hastened thoughtfully onward to their Mother, who lay ill in her bed. All their thoughts were about her,—and so nothing stopped them by the way.

"You should have seen them, how softly they stole into the room, and how quietly they sat by her bed while she slept, though the broad sun was now shining high in the heavens, and other children were tempted out to enjoy the sweets of the Spring-time. You should have watched them weaving, and weaving, flower after flower, and bud after bud, till at last all was made into one long chain of pale yellow gold!

"When the last flower-thought was added to the link, the two children joined the ends together, making it into one perfect chain-wreath. They then passed it softly round their Mother's neck. As they did so, the light links touched—just touched her cheek,—and she awoke.

"How sorry they were to wake her,—and yet how glad they felt to see her open her eyes!

"As the Mother saw and felt how closely her children's thought were twined about her, she grew strong enough to rise. She laid her hands fondly upon their little heads, and she kissed their lips over and over again.

"Tiny and Wee-thing were astonished and overjoyed to see what a bright warm flush of health was now returning to their beloved Mother's cheek.

"When they asked her, as they both did with one voice, how it was that she grew so quickly well, she answered:—'I was indeed faint and weary, but the thoughts of my children are a chain that binds me to life."—*Zodiac of Flowers* (*London.*)

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

ACQUITTAL OF A WITCH.—In Montrol's life of Brissot an anecdote is given of Lord Mansfield. On going the circuit, he had one day a poor old woman brought before him under an accusation of witchcraft. Though exceedingly infirm, it was asserted by all the inhabitants of the village in which she resided, whose positiveness was, in all probability, in exact proportion to the absurdity of what they advanced, that she had been seen walking with her feet in the air and head downwards. The witnesses exhibited the greatest eagerness that she should be punished as a witch. The judge, after listening with the greatest composure to the depositions, observed, with a solemn countenance, "Since you have seen this poor woman walking in the air, though her legs are scarcely able to support her on the earth, I can, of course, entertain no doubt of the fact; but this witch is an English-woman, and subject as well as you and I to the laws of England, every one of which I have just run over in my mind, without being able to hit upon any one which prohibits persons from walking in the air if they should find it convenient. All those persons, therefore, who have seen the accused perform her aerial promenades are at liberty to imitate her example."—*Cradle of Twin Giants.*

—— STRIKING EXAMPLE OF FORCE AND FIRMNESS OF CHARACTER.—Boswell tells an anecdote of his esteemed friend Akerman, characteristic of the prison-world at that time. A fire broke out in that part of Newgate in which the officers lived: this was before the present buildings were erected. The prisoners, seeing the flames, became alarmed for their own safety, and rushed to the gate, shouting "Down with it! We shall be burnt!" It was a moment of great excitement, and the men were about to carry their shout into effect, when Akerman appeared at the grill, and commanded silence. After a little confusion, they allowed him to speak. He told them, with great calmness, that the gate must not go down; that they were under his care, and not a man of them should be suffered to escape. But he could assure them that the fire was not in the prison, properly so called, which was built entirely of stone; and there was no danger. If they would behave quietly, he said he would come into them, and remain with them until they were convinced that the danger was past. To this they agreed. He then ordered them to fall back from the gate: it was lowered, and he stepped in. Then, turning to the under-keeper, who now stood on the other side of the grill, he commanded him, in a resolute tone, not to open the gate on any account, not even if the prisoners should compel him to give the order for it. Having shown them in this manner that he would die with them rather than allow a general escape, he conducted them by passages, of which he carried the keys, to a part of the gaol farthest from that where the fire was raging; and having brought them into a place of safety, addressed them—"Gentlemen," he said, "you are now convinced that I told you true. I have no doubt the engines will soon extinguish this fire; if they do not, a guard will come, and you shall all be taken out, and lodged in the Compter. I assure you, upon my word and honor, that I have not a farthing insured. I have left my house that I might take care of you. I will keep my promise and stay with you, if you insist upon it; but if you will allow me to go and look after my family and property, I shall be much obliged to you." This appeal went home, and they all cried out for him to go. Happily no further mischief was done by the fire. *Hepworth Dixon's Prisons of London.*

——REMARKABLE SPOT.——Perhaps there is not a spot in Paris more interesting, historically, than is the Place de la Concorde. In May, 1770, while the people were rejoicing on the occasion of the marriage of Louis XVI., the police imprudently allowed several carriages to drive about among the crowd; the horse of one of these vehicles became restive, and frightened the people near them; this fear was communicated to many who did not know the cause thereof, and suddenly a panic seized upon the immense crowd, who, rushing towards the Rue Nationale, then the Rue Royale, which had just been broken up for building, a fearful catastrophe took place. 1200 were literally trampled to death, and 2000 more severely injured. It was here that the people and soldiers of the Prince de Lambese's regiment accidentally encountered each other, and fought the precursor battle to the storming of the Bastile. In twenty-three years after the fatal accident on the occasion of his wedding, Louis XVI., was here beheaded, midway between the centre of the Place and the group of restive horses at the Champe Elysées. Charlotte Corday, the Judith-like assassin of Marat, perished here as did Brissot and twenty-nine of his colleagues. Marie Antoinette suffered midway between the obelisk and the gate of the Tuileries. Philippe Egalité was destroyed here on the 14th of November, 1793, and the Herbitists, Muratists, and Orleanists, fell on the March following. Danton, Camille Desmoulins, Hebert, and those known as the Dantonists, breathed their last below the axe here. Here, eight days after the above, perished Chaumette, Anacharsis Clooti, the wives of Camille Desmoulins, and others known as the Atheists; and shortly after these died Elizabeth, the sister of Louis XVI., by the stroke of the guillotine. Robspierre, St. Just, Dumas, and Couthon, also breathed their last